

dispensation and religion was *personal*, as well as *national*.

3dly, That the Christian dispensation is *political* and *external* also, in its *form*, *regimen*, and *privileges*; and I take it, that baptism, (tho its greatest use is to be subservient to real godliness and salvation, yet) primarily belongs to the *external polity* of the church *visible*, viz. to render a man a professed member thereof, and intitled to the communion and the honourable advantageous privileges of Christian societies; and therefore all that believed or assented to Christ's doctrine, were *presently* enter'd into the church, in order to be trained up in godliness, without staying to see whether they were already effectually pious Christians or not, and so it was in *John's* baptism, *Mat.* 3. 5, 6, 7. On the other hand, the most eminently pious and devout, who less needed repentance, or to strengthen their bonds of obedience, and who were accepted of God already, as of the church *invisible*, (such as *Cornelius*) were yet to be baptized to let them into the *external* church. And upon this account the posterity of Christian profelytes may perhaps be as reasonably admitted, tho unbaptiz'd, into the church now as formerly, so as not to be counted *aliens* and *foreigners*, but a part of the *household of faith*, tho future happiness depend on other things than church-privileges; and indeed, if baptism was *only* or *primarily* intended to serve the increase of inward piety and repentance, I can't think but on occasion of declensions and decay of a man's piety, it would be repeated to quicken and recover him, as the *Eucharist* is; but as the *direct* use is to be a *visible* badge of initiation and relation, so that first baptism continues still, and therefore we have but *one baptism*. As he was not a circumcised *Jew* to the purpose of salvation, who

was

was not so inwardly, but yet was a *few*; and counted of the circumcision rightfully, if he was not for gross transgression cut off; so is it with baptized Christians; they are not such to the purpose of salvation, who are not inwardly pure, but yet are to be esteem'd members of the *visible* church, unless cast out for some grievous offence. There is an *external* use of baptism, relating to the *visible* order and regimen of the church; so that it is in this respect much upon the same foot with circumcision, or with *profelyte baptism* under the *Jewish* law, and may as well descend on posterity. BAPTISM is not supposed to save any, but *the answer of a good conscience* in performing the holy part, which our religion enjoins; yet *baptism* may make them of the church of God on earth, who before were not so, and bring them under the government, discipline, and care of his family; but whether this be required of Christians offspring, who are born in the house, is the *inquiry* before us.

I am, &c.



The End of the FIRST VOLUME.



1225. e. 2.

THE
WORKS
OF
Mr. *Thomas Emlyn.*

VOLUME II.

CONTAINING,

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>I. Remarks on Mr. <i>Leslie's</i> first Dialogue against the <i>Socinians</i>. 1708.</p> <p>II. A Vindication of the said Remarks. 1708.</p> <p>III. An Examination of Mr. <i>Leslie's</i> last Dialogue, relating to the <i>Satisfaction</i> of Jesus Christ. 1708.</p> <p>IV. An Enquiry into the Authority of 1 <i>John</i> 5. 7. <i>There are three that bear record, &c.</i> 1715.</p> <p>V. An Answer to Mr. <i>Martin's</i> Dissertation thereon. 1718.</p> <p>VI. A Reply to Mr. <i>Martin's</i> Examination of the said Answer. 1720.
<i>Now added, A Postscript containing three Letters from F. Le Long and Mr. La Croze.</i></p> | <p>VII. Dr. <i>Bennet's</i> New Theory of the Trinity examined. 1718.</p> <p>VIII. Remarks on the Four <i>London</i> Ministers Defence of the Doctrine of the Trinity. 1719.</p> <p>IX. Notes on Mr. <i>Trosse's</i> <i>Catechism</i>, relating to the Deity of the Lord <i>Jesus Christ</i> and of the <i>Holy Ghost</i>. 1719.</p> <p>X. Observations on Dr. <i>Waterland's</i> Notions, in relation to <i>Polytheism</i>, <i>Disheism</i>, the Son's <i>Consubstantiality</i> with and <i>Inferiority</i> to the Father. <i>Wrote</i> 1731.
<i>Now first published.</i></p> <p>XI. Memoirs of the Life and Sentiments of Dr. <i>Samuel Clarke</i>. <i>Wrote</i> 1731.
<i>Now first published.</i></p> |
|---|--|

L O N D O N :

Printed in the Year MDCCXLVI.

THE
WORKS
OF
MR. THOMAS EMERY.
H. M. U. L. V.
ERRATA.

- Pag. 2, in the Contents, the pages should all be
two numbers forward.
Pag. 49. l. 16. for *admit* read *omit*.
Pag. 88. l. 2. in the notes, for 330 read 130.
Pag. 273. l. 16. dele *a* after the word *ferois*.
Pag. 297. l. 4. for *there is a passage to this purpose*,
read *this passage is mention'd*.
Pag. 459. in the note † dele *2d.* and in the note ||
dele *2d.*
Pag. 495. l. 3. for 1728 read 1729.

43.

4. — 6.

290.



REMARKS

ON
THE CONTENTS

Mr. Charles Leslie's First

A contradiction in the nature is so in another. Page 2

DIALOGUE

A Trinity of three Persons will not agree with
the incarnation of the Son only. P. 7

ON THE

Not a Trinity of three minds, or three real persons, with the Unity of God. P. 9

Socinian Controversy.

Generation in the Divine nature not proved to be necessary. P. 10

The possibility of attributing to one nature what is
the property of another. P. 12

1708.

VOL. II.

A

The CONTENTS

A contradiction in one nature is so in another. Page 2

*A Trinity of three Faculties will not agree with
the incarnation of the Son only. P. 7*

*Nor a Trinity of three minds, or three real per-
sons, with the Unity of God. p. 9*

*Generation in the Divine nature not prov'd to be
necessary. p. 10*

*The absurdity of attributing to one nature what is
the property of another. - p. 12*



Remarks on Mr. Charles Leslie's First Dialogue on the Socinian Controversy.

S I R,

I Who am a true Scriptural Trinitarian, am far from rejecting, as a contradiction, any doctrine that bears the genuine stamp of divine revelation, merely because it has some difficulties attending it which I cannot solve, or because I cannot frame an adequate notion of it; nay, I firmly believe there is no contradiction in the Scripture-account of the holy Trinity, to the divine *Unity*: But yet I must freely tell you, that I am no way assisted to answer the common objections of that kind, from what you offer towards clearing the vulgar notions of a Trinity from the imputation of contradiction and inconsistency.

There may be contradiction enough in the common explications of that doctrine, for ought you have said in the matter. Nor have I ever met with less rational satisfaction in the point, than in your late uncharitable dialogue. If such poor philosophy, such shallow reasoning, and such gross divinity, must baffle the *Socinians*; I con-

Remarks on Mr. Leslie's

4
fess they ought to be the last who pretend to the character of *Men of Reason*.

To their charge of a contradiction upon the explication of the Trinity, you offer these things in your defence.

P. 7.

1. Say you, *That may not be a contradiction in one nature, which is so in another.* But here you greatly err; for a contradiction always consists of two inconsistent parts or terms; and wherever those two terms are united in any proposition, 'tis always a contradiction; let it be apply'd to what nature you will. Indeed there may be something attributed to one nature, where there is nothing inconsistent or contradictory to it; which, if attributed to another, might meet with something inconsistent, whence a contradiction will arise in the one and not the other: but as one of the terms alone is not the contradiction in any case, so where both the inconsistent parts are join'd 'tis always a contradiction, and of the same size, in any nature. I should indeed suppose you might mean thus, were it not for those ridiculous instances you bring for the illustration of your meaning; where you intimate, that tho' 'tis a contradiction, for our legs to move two yards as soon as one; yet 'tis none for the eyes to reach a star as soon as the top of a chimney; or for the thoughts to go to Rome, as soon as the next street: and gravely conclude, *Thus you see that what is a contradiction to legs, is none to eyes nor to thought*; and oft speak of the motion of sight and thought: adding, that all the philosophy in the world cannot reconcile its going two yards as soon as one from downright contradiction, (for so you express it.) But are you indeed so very weak as to think you move all the way to Rome, and are got thither as soon as you think of it? No, Sir, whatever haste you may be in thither, you go no faster than your legs

P. 8, 9.

First Dialogue.

5

legs can carry you. And should you challenge all the philosophy in the world, who have so little as not to know, that when you think of *Rome* or any other place, 'tis only the *Idea* of it in your imagination which you contemplate, and not a leap or local motion of your thoughts to it? In like manner when you see the stars, our eyes move not up to them, but their extended rays strike upon the eye. I see you have a head much fitter for entertaining and coining mysteries, than for explaining or defending them. It's a wonder you did not think rather, that *Rome* and *Constantinople* shift and come into your head: and then since in other cases a lesser vessel cannot contain a greater, nor a nutshell hold an house, you might wonder how your little head should hold such great cities; and with the same philosophy infer, that what is a contradiction to *nutshells* is none to *heads*, and challenge all philosophy to reconcile it.

2. You say, *No contradiction can be charg'd in any nature we don't understand*; For which reason you say, *We must not object contradictions in the incomprehensible nature of God, from comparing it with our own*. I should grant this, in an object of which we have no knowledge at all: but surely if I have some, tho' a partial knowledge of the infinite God, I may discern what is contradictory to that little knowledge of him. Nor is any thing more usual or just, than to deny such or such a doctrine, because incompatible to the divine attributes, to his spirituality, eternity, goodness, &c. tho perhaps some of these are not plainer nor better known than the divine Unity. So that one may as well perceive some things to be contradictory to the divine *Unity*, as we do others to be so to his purity, and spirituality, &c. for why should this *Unity* be thought the only obscure attribute among Christians? And therefore there is no more caution due here than in all other reasonings

sonings from other divine perfections known but in part.

P. 6.

Nay, you yourself frankly grant, that we may perceive some things to be a contradiction when affirm'd of God : for you say, that 'tis a *contradiction to say, three persons are but one person* ; and you are not ignorant (or if you be, you are not most fit to write in this controversy) that the Unitarians take this to be the very case, *viz.* that you make *three persons of one person*, whatever you say ; for they imagine, that God Almighty, in the complete notion of God, is but one person, expressed by single personal notes, *I, Thou, or He*. They fancy you pray to him as one person, when you address thus, *O Thou, Lord, &c.* They don't observe any to cry, *O ye hear us, &c.* But if that be your meaning, pray consider if you do well, by using the single pronoun, to give them occasion to suspect, that you take God for one single person, when you may so easily amend it, by saying always, *O ye* in the plural. *They* are ready to say, that when you prove the *Son* or *Spirit* to be a person, you do it from such personal notes as shew each of them to be one *He* ; and that if under one *He, Me, Thou, &c.* (by which God Almighty is perpetually express'd in Scripture) three *He's* are included, (for instance, if the words, *no Gods before me*, mean *none before us three*) then how shall they be sure, that under the person of *Son, or Spirit*, tho spoken of as one *He* each, there may not be many persons intended by you ? Now you'll do well to shew, that God is not one *He* or person, or that there are not three persons in him in a proper sense, such as the proofs some bring for the three persons do mean, if they prove any thing. Without this, you did not well in making so liberal a concession, *viz.* that

First Dialogue.

7

that 'tis a contradiction for three persons to be but one person, if you hold both.

3. You advance this odd paradox, that if the doctrine of the Trinity *be a contradiction*, it could not be an invention; annexing this shrewd reason for it, *For who could invent a contradiction?* As if P. 24. no error (which ever implies a contradiction to some truth) can be an invention: whereas all errors are nothing else but inventions; and a Socinian will say, as you represent him, that you run into these contradictions by mistaking the holy text. Whether you do mistake it or not, or whether you get by the mistake or not, I meddle not; but 'tis a fair account, how 'tis possible and easy for contradictions to be invented: and your saying, you don't mistake the text, be it ever so truly said, is not to the purpose, since they, believing you do mistake, can satisfy themselves how it might arise, and are no way tempted to think it better than an invention, merely for its seeming to them a contradiction.

But tho you have said so little to the purpose against the objection of a contradiction in the point; yet, as I said, I argue not upon that head, and therefore leave it,

To consider what notion you'll give of the Trinity: for indeed till men know *what Trinity* in God you mean, 'tis in vain to prove any more than a Trinity *in general*, which is not deny'd. You offer us some parallels and *images* to help our conceptions, but very inconsistent ones. One while 'tis a Trinity like *three faculties* of one mind, and another while 'tis like a Trinity of three men or *minds*; which two are just as opposite as three persons, and one person, which you say is a contradiction: so that both cannot be true images of the same thing.

A 4

I. You

Remarks on Mr. Leslie's

1. You resemble it often to three faculties (that is, three operations) of the one soul, where
P. 14. you say, *The understanding is the father faculty; the memory is begotten by it, and the will proceeds from both.* This you say, is an image of the several persons of the Deity. Now, tho you are out
P. 30. in your account of the nature and pedigree of the faculties, when you make the memory another faculty, which is but an act of the understanding, and so is no image of a second person; and when, supposing it another essential faculty, you say, 'tis begotten by the understanding faculty, whereas 'tis only the exercise of the memory that the understanding can occasion, and not the principle, which is before any act of the understanding: yet when you have pleased your fancy ever so much, with these pretty jingles, this is nothing to the Socinians, it only shews, how three operations of a mind may be in but one person, not how three persons may be in one mind; unless the divine persons are but, so many operations or thoughts. Besides, they will ask such allegorical Trinitarians, (for I assure you in this case, you are not
Q. 25. charg'd with keeping too much to the letter of the text, as you pretend, but too little, in making three such distinct agents, as Father, Son, and Spirit, to dwindle into a thin figure or *Prosopopæia*) whether Arius, or Socinus, or any Unitarians, ever deny'd such a Trinity? Were they such fools as not to believe, God knows and loves himself? And can't he do this without being three persons, which is done by every single finite person? If this be eternal generation and procession, they are for it; and they have been barbarously used if this was all the charge against them, which all know they were clear of, and that they believ'd God has somewhat answering to our three faculties.

You

You pretend, That notwithstanding the unlikeness of three faculties to three persons, you must yet use the term *persons*, because we must not alter the phrase of Scripture; and yet the Scripture has no such phrase at all as *three persons in one God*. Your alledging the words, *the image of his Father's person*, is here impertinent for proof of three persons in God; it only proves God the Father to be a person, which none deny: tho the word *ἰμὸς-αὐτοῦ* signify'd then *substance*, Heb. 11. 1, not *person*. You of all ought to give a better reason than this for using the terms, *three persons*, of God; because (if I mistake not) at the end of Mr. Gildon's *Deists Manual* you have said, that the word *person*, apply'd to God, is used in a sense infinitely different from what it means when used of men. Now if it be infinitely different, 'tis at the widest distance possible; and nothing can be more unfitly made use of than such terms as express all the unlikeness possible to the thing intended. 'Tis a ready way to deceive men, to use terms that are the farthest off, of any we can devise, from expressing the true meaning: 'tis better saying nothing of God, than what begets corrupt ideas of him.

However, will this sort of Trinity, like to three operations of man's mind, accord with the Scripture-Trinity of the Father, Son, and Spirit, who have such distinct parts and agencies assign'd 'em, as cannot be so much as shadow'd out by our three faculties? You grant the *Father* was not incarnate, but the *Son*. Can the understanding be incarnate, and sent, and humbled, &c. and not the will? Are not the three faculties always in the same human mind, which is incarnate without division? Do you teach us, that the divine nature is incarnate without its understanding, or father faculty? No, there must be more distinction

tion than this between the *not-incarnate* Father, and the *incarnate* Son.

P. 30.

Besides, don't you think the *Son of God* knows himself, and retains that knowledge, and loves himself? And if so, then, according to you, he is the *person knowing, and the person known, loving and lov'd*, as you learnedly distinguish. And this will make three such persons in each person, by reflecting on himself: for this seems to be your argument, a man knows himself, *ergo* he and himself are two persons. And at this rate a good wit may allegorize all the absurdities of the *Alcoran* into fair meanings, and silence all your objections against it, tho the vulgar people be still left to their own gross conceptions, while they take the literal and obvious meaning: nor do you build upon such a Trinity, like that of three faculties; for you have another scheme, which fits your notions better. Therefore,

P. 6.

2. You resemble the Trinity to three *human* persons in the same human nature: but then lest the *Socinians* should infer, that three divine persons will in like manner be three Gods, as three human persons are three men, you will not allow it to be *strictly true to say, two or three men*, when so many human persons are spoken of, but think there may be many human persons in the *same one nature*. And yet in short, you tell the *Socinian*, that if he would allow that *several persons might partake of one divine nature*, as he does allow they do of *one human nature*, the dispute was at an end, as to the substance of it. But, Sir, the *Unitarians* do not allow one and the same nature to have many persons in it; they judge every man has a particular nature and substance of his own, in which none partakes, only that others have such another like nature to his; they cry, human nature in general is a mere *ens rationis*, a notion of the

First Dialogue.

11

the mind, arising from the comparing one man's nature with another.

However, if three divine persons be like three human persons as to their unity of nature; then I doubt they will, in consequence hereof, be deem'd to be *three infinite divine minds*, as three human persons have three finite minds, let 'em be ever-so much one in their *nature*, or kind. And if three divine persons should as properly be accounted three Gods, as three human persons can (in strict speech) be accounted three men; and are as truly three infinite minds or spirits, as three men are three finite minds; there is a sad end of the dispute indeed. But on the other hand, if three men (or human persons) in the same *one single nature* or *mind*, be a contradiction, then you give the Unitarians too much occasion to think the like of your notions of the Trinity, by making this parallel.

Moreover, if God teach us to number men by *two, ten, &c.* and yet in opposition to such plurality, tells us, there is but one God, or rather that *God is but one, unus*, or *εἷς*, it warns us that his unity is inconsistent with such a plurality of persons as is in your human nature. You add, *if P. 17. we say, there is not more than one human nature, we cannot say, there is more than one divine nature, tho several persons partake of it.* Now this shews your notion of the unity, which you sacrifice to that of a Trinity: and upon this notion of *several infinite minds*, your scheme is built; as your arguments for the eternal Generation of the *Son*, and procession of the Holy Ghost, do manifest: for you tell us, God must needs *generate* and produce other persons on these accounts.

1. Because 'tis a *perfection in man* to propagate: *We see trees spring from trees, beasts, fish, fowl, P. 31. and man propagate their kind; and shall God be barren?*

barren? say you, and hook in a figurative text, *Isa. 66. 9.* according to the *vulgar translation*, to back you; and truly you wanted a better authority for such a paradox. For you ought to know, that man's propagation is so far from being an absolute perfection, that 'tis founded in his infirmity; he need not be multiply'd, but for want of others to succeed him when dead, or to aid and assist him while living. And as Angels, who are more perfect, do not propagate, I suppose; so neither will men, when they come to a more perfect state; this will cease with their present imperfections. It seems then the nearer to God, the less there is of *this* propagation.

But why must God be barren, for not propagating? Are not angels and men his offspring? and he the Father of the whole creation? Would you have the Almighty propagate as thick as the trees? I doubt you'll think him else, to be comparatively barren. The reason you give for not multiplying persons and *productions*, or communications in God, [*viz. if it be infinite, it can be no more than one; and to infinite productions nothing can be added; but human productions may be repeated, because finite*] should be consider'd, as it seems to lie against any infinite production in him at all. For it may be objected, that many infinite productions are no more absurd than many infinite persons; and that if infinite person may be repeated, and can have an addition, why not other infinities?

2. Because God would be stinted in his happiness, if there were not a person (you must mean another person) to communicate all his thoughts to; and this must be an infinite person, for, say you, *nothing but infinite can contain infinite*. See more to this purpose, p. 32. And a little before, you argue for your point from man's want of some to converse with; else his life is a burden, say you;

Who

Who would be content to live, if there was never a man in the world but himself? Such a solitary indigent Being you suppose the great *Jehovah* to be, that without company he cannot be happy. What a base ignoble notion is this of that perfect Being, as if infinite wisdom and all perfection could want any thing more, and can't be happy, unless it be multiply'd into two minds. Thus you make him *barren* indeed, while you talk of the divine *fecundity*; and tempt the *Unitarians* to think, that *three such persons* as you would make them, are not so great as their *one, self-sufficient, eternal mind*.

By these things you discover your opinion plainly, that you are for three *infinite minds* or spirits; and that by the divine *generation* of the Son, you don't mean only his *self-reflexion*, but a production of another infinite mind: for otherwise you talk inconsistently; nor is there any shadow of resemblance between man and God in the case which you argue upon. For you can't mean, that man is solitary and miserable for want of conversing with his *own mind*, but for want of *another man* to discourse with: and accordingly must mean, that God could not be happy neither, without *another infinite mind*. Nor does any deny him to contemplate himself, that you need argue for that against the *Socinians*; so that your meaning is plain. You do well to have two schemes in readiness, one a Trinity of *faculties*, which serves to explain the *unity*; the other of three *minds* (each with those three faculties), which makes out a sufficient Trinity. This latter you and others make use of when you explain the *incarnation*; because it is hard shewing the *Son's nature* or *mind* to be incarnate, and not the *Father's*, if it be the same particular individual mind that is both *Father* and *Son*; but the former is

used in explaining the Trinity in general, and in *Thess.* Now if these two happen to be inconsistent taken together, you cannot help that, because to be *three* minds and yet but *one*, is hard to reconcile.

In my mind you needed not to insist on the authority of the heathenish philosophers about the divine *fecundity*, and a *Trinity* in God; since your adversaries have been so willing to own you to be *Paganish* enough in your notions. And as you own there is *some* corruption in the *Pagan* notions of these matters, so they imagine there is *more* than you apprehend. Vid. *Platonism unweild.*

Let me only remark one thing more, viz. that when you illustrate the union of the divine nature to the human in *Jesus Christ*, by the union of man's soul to his body, p. 51. you don't account well for the communication of the properties of the two natures. You (tho contrary to the *Alexandrian* and best copies) read that text, *Acts* 20. 28. of *God's blood*, and think what was done in the man, may be said as truly of the united God; as *man is said to eat*, &c. when it *belongs only to the body*. Whereas in *this last* speech the properties of the body are not at all attributed to the soul, as those of the *human* are by you to the *divine* nature. To say, *God shed his blood*, or *was flesh*, or *made flesh*, is answerable to such expressions, as *the soul drinks*, the *soul is made body*, &c. And if we never speak so, notwithstanding the personal union in man, then it may seem hard to justify such expressions, as *God's blood and dying*, &c. by any such personal union of the two natures, as never is a ground for such communication of properties, in the instance you parallel it by.

You

You say nothing from Scripture for the *procession* of the Holy Spirit (as distinct from generation) which is a great article of faith, only that he *pro-* John 15.
ceeds from the Father, or *goes forth*. So all gifts do, 26.
and Christ *proceeded* from the Father too, and *be* Ch. 8. 42.
proceeded (the very word used of the Spirit) *from* 14. 28.
Jericho. Is that all the ground you would shew Mark 10.
for such a distinct article? 46.

To conclude, unless you state your notion more clearly, what Trinity you will maintain, it is in vain to cap texts about you know not what. 'Tis easy to bend a phrase divers ways. Unless you fix your notion of a Trinity more distinctly, had you not better leave men to believe only some Trinity in general, tho they can't well tell what? And tho you may think there is no such vast difference between believing and not believing, one knows not what in particular, as that men should damn and hereticate each other for it; yet certainly 'tis better to be content with this *little implicit* faith, than to go about explaining what you cannot. For when all's done, a man's *faith* is not his *words*, but his sense and *meaning*; and he who *says* a large *creed*, but *means nothing*, believes no more, nor makes any more use of it, than he who denies it all, let him boast never so of his faith.

And when you have brought a text or two for Christ's being called *God*; and suppose it to be the supreme God that is united to the man Christ Jesus, yet if the *Unitarians* say, 'tis God the *Father* (as they gather from *John* 14. 10.) who was *manifest in that flesh*, and so the *Father* and he be *one*, in as near union as you imagine of a second person; and that therefore he is called, as you say, the *Everlasting Father*; which *they think* gave Isa. 9. 6.
great virtue to his performances; what are you the nearer?

You'll do great service indeed, if you satisfy the Unitarians scruples; but, not by corporeal resemblances of the Trinity to three (or four) dimensions or postures of a body; or of the eternal generation to the light (which you call an effect of the Sun, but is indeed the very Sun itself, and so may well be as old) nor by vain boasts of the early Fathers (so often yielded up to the Arians) nor by concealing their strongest objections. Shew 'em that they have no ground to imagine two or three Gods (or infinite minds) to be imply'd in your scheme of the Trinity, as they have fancied, not so much from the expressions *God of God*, and *one equal to God* (and so far not the very same) in divine perfections; as from the nature of your scheme itself; as when you hold the divine nature to be personally united to man, but yet not the Father; as if, say they, he was not in that divine nature that is incarnate, but another. Also, that the Divine Nature and the Three Persons, are the same [else, say your own side, there will be a Quaternity, viz. three persons, and one Nature besides;] yet the three persons are not incarnate, tho the divine nature (which is the same thing) be: that tho there be three persons in the divine nature alone, yet when that nature is joined to another intelligent nature, 'tis all but one person. Indeed two or three infinite minds would easily solve all this; but then the Oxford decree 1695, has declared that impious and heretical. No doubt you'll do it another way; and having also made it appear, that there is no such difficulty in supposing a begotten being to be self-existent and independent; or else that he should be supreme God, and the first cause, tho not self-existent, but dependent; and may have all the perfections of God, tho he have not that of unbegotten self-

See Le
Blanc
Thes. de
Dei sim-
plicit.
p. 100.

self-existence: Then I say, you'll go on smoothly with your texts. But if you silently grant them, that *these* are really contradictions, and really chargeable on your opinions, you'll not wonder if they conclude, all those human comments of God's word, which support them, to be erroneous. That you therefore, Sir, may not lose your labour, nor they the benefit of it; pray be so kind as to take this advice from one, who truly wishes to see the *Unitarians* errors detected, and that you may write to better purpose for the *Church*, than you are said to have written for the *State*.



Fifth Dialogue.

Self-exultation: Then I say, you'll go on bravely
with your pen. But if you really stand in
that case as really convinced, and really
changeable on your opinions, you'll not wonder
if they conclude all those human commitments of
God's word, which support them, to be erro-
neous. Then you threaten, Sir, may not lose
your labour, not they the benefit of it; they be
lo kind as to take this advice from one who truly
wishes to see the Christian errors destroyed, and
that you may write to better purpose for the
Cause, than you are led to have written for me.



A

VINDICATION

REMARKS

On Mr. *Charles Leslie's*

FIRST DIALOGUE

ON THE
Socinian Controversy.

1708.

B 2

A

VINDICATION

The CONTENTS.

*How contradictions may be discerned, even
when relating to God, tho he be incompre-
hensible.* P. 31

*To say the contrary lays a foundation for
Scepticism.* P. 33

The plural Elohim is used of a single person. P. 38

1781

B



*A Vindication of the Remarks
upon Mr. Charles Leslie's
First Dialogue.*

S I R,

I SHALL soon pass over your preamble, in which you represent me for a *Socinian*, as if every one, who has not so good an opinion of the truth of contradictions as you have, must needs be such; and also your feigning me to be in a *passion*, for only censuring your weak arguments, that you might poorly infer thence, I was a *loser by my talking*; while a whole torrent of personal reflections on the dead, by whole mouthfuls of reproach, viz. That *pragmatical Heretic*, Dial. 2. *ignorant Pedant Biddle*, witnesses the candor and p. 60. tenderness of your *meek inoffensive spirit*: all this I wave as little to the purpose, and proceed upon the argument.

I perceive, by your answer to the *Remarks*, that you are resolved to found your scheme of a Trinity on *mystery* and *ignorance*, and to cover yourself from the *Unitarians* by impenetrable darkness, which you make your defence. You seem to admit, that as far as human reason can

A Vindication of the Remarks

judge, there are irreconcilable contradictions in your scheme of faith: and therefore, in order to support your notions, you endeavour to support the credit of plain contradictions; intimating, that we conceive of God no otherwise than as a blind man does of *light*, i. e. with a mind full of contradictions. To this end

You asserted, That what is a contradiction in one nature, may be none in another. I affirm the contrary, that a contradiction, consisting of two repugnant propositions, is ever the same, apply it to what nature you will; because the same thing cannot both be, and not be at once, whether it be said of God or Man.

You attempted to prove your paradox by the motion of the thoughts to *Rome*, &c. and of the eyes to the stars as soon as to the chimney-top; which, you say, implies the going two yards as soon as one: which is a contradiction in walking, you grant, but not in the motion of thoughts and eyes. Now, tho' I had shown, that there was really no such motion in the thoughts or eyes, and you seem to be ashamed of it, and therefore shift off one part on your man without thought, which is a contradictory supposition, (which it was time for you to quit, and therefore I shall not expose you for it) and another upon some poor blind man; that your self might not bear the shame of such folly; yet you are again trumping up your old instances, and argue from 'em as if they were true; especially from the motion of sight, and the impossibility of a born-blind man's conception of light, any otherwise than by allowing the aforesaid contradiction (as 'tis in the motion of the legs) to take place here in the eyes. You ask, *How can you explain to him, how the eye can reach a star as soon as the chimney? He feels his eye with his hand*
that

that 'tis fixed in his head: how then can he imagine it gets a thousand miles off, while he feels it does not stir? Did ever any man trifle worse? I tell you, and you seem to admit it, that there is no such thing as the eyes moving a thousand miles; and yet you suppose your blind man must be falsely told, and must believe it. I don't wonder if the poor abus'd man conceive that to be a flat contradiction, which in truth is so even to a seeing man, and which he ought not to believe. But does this prove, that 'tis no contradiction to move a thousand yards as soon as one, because you falsely told him, and he foolishly believ'd you, that your eyes did move so, when they never could do it, because 'tis a contradiction? I thought you were to prove a real contradiction in one case to be none in another; and now you suppose a contradiction which is not, and conclude from it as if it truly were. So that

This is in effect your argument; supposing the eyes did move to the stars as soon as to the chimney, or your thoughts to Rome in an instant, (as they do not) then here would be an instance of that being a contradiction in one case, viz. in Legs, which is none in another, viz. Eyes: but tho there is no such thing in the premises, yet the conclusion is true, because it would have been true, if the premises had been so. No doubt, Sir, you argue very desperately! How does this prove a contradiction in one case may be none in another?

But, say you, 'Tis impossible to explain to him what sight is, so as to reconcile it from being a contradiction to him. I answer, That a true and just explication of it will not contain any real contradiction in it: and if to him it appears a contradiction, 'tis from his mistake alone; and you are not to shew that a seeming contradiction may

P. 6.

be none, (for who doubts that?) but that a *real* contradiction may, in some cases, be none. And I pray what contradiction will appear to him according to what was said, *That the eye moves not up, but the star strikes on the eye?* To this you say, *The blind man does not feel this, nor knows what you mean by it, or by seeing.* But is this any contradiction to him, that he should not feel every *subtile* particle that touches on him? or that he should have no idea of sight? You add, *he can't think of any other way, but that the eye must get up to the star, or the star come down to the eye.* I expected he could only imagine his eye went up to the star, as you had suggested before, to represent the contradiction of moving so far in an instant; and now you allow him another conception of sight, *viz. That the star may extend to his eye.* But this is quite another matter from your instance of the eye's *going up* so many thousand miles, and has no such appearance of a contradiction. Nor will it serve your turn for an example of a *contradiction's becoming no contradiction*: so that, it seems, he may be convince'd *another way*, than by persuading him, that what is a contradiction in one nature, is *none in another*, which you say is the only way, and I that 'tis no way at all; and if he be to be convinced this way, he must be suppos'd to have a worse blemish than want of eye-sight.

The most you can reasonably pretend to here is, That I can't by my words, help him to form a just idea of sight, (which is thro' his want of necessary organs) but it does not thence follow, that he ought to take up with a conception that implies plain contradictions, which he knows must be wrong, and ought to be rejected: for tho he may not conceive what sight is, (nor is it made his duty, as in the other case, to which you parallel it) yet he may be sure 'tis not made

up

up of contradictions. A man may not understand a thing, and yet understand very well that contradictions about it are false; and this is all the stress I laid upon this instance. So that this is no argument against objecting contradictions to some mens notions of the divine nature; since in no case whatever are the blindest creatures oblig'd to believe direct contradictions, nor would they become no contradictions, if they should believe 'em erroneously.

To what purpose then was that faint triumph? I will join issue with him upon it, if he can find P. 3. words proper to express the nature of sight to a man born blind, and will give him leave to infer contradictions from such words according as he understands 'em; then I will undertake to solve all the contradictions in the terms, by which we express the Holy Trinity. To explain it so as to enable him to form a clear idea of it in his imagination, I neither undertook, nor is it his duty to have such an idea, much less to take up with any that are false. But still I say, that a true explication of the operation of sight will never lead him to infer contradictions. If he imagine any, which are certain contradictions in other cases, he as certainly does not rightly take in the true explication of this, and ought to conclude he is in an error, and to set himself against it; and must either bring his thoughts to a consistency, or explicitly believe nothing in the matter: for no man, pretend what he will, does believe apparent contradictions to be none, or (which is the same) to be possibly true; he must, at least, suspend his assent.

And yet, I believe, as to matter of fact, that many such blind persons, tho they have no distinct idea of sight, are very far from entertaining contradictions about it; at least they would be so,

so, if they had understanding instructors that did not err, as is suppos'd in your case; where God is reputed the teacher of *your notions* of the Holy Trinity, who will hardly be thought to leave any doctrine upon us, to be believ'd under the unavoidable notion of a contradiction.

Therefore, if there were no difference between the two cases you think to be so like, *viz.* of a blind man's conceiving such a thing as *light*, and your conception of the Trinity; yet there is no reason from thence for taking up with contradictions in the latter, since 'tis not requisite nor fit to do so in the former.

Besides, who can easily believe such a case to be really true in the Christian dispensation, *viz.* that the all-wise and good God should impose upon a generation of men, *born blind*, a long *creed*, of the nature of *light*, and *refractions*, and colours, or a *system of optics*; of which they could have no manner of conception, nor make any use, only it might set 'em together by the ears in ignorant contention? Or that ever he would be pleas'd with such of themselves, as should presume to be paraphrasing on *light and colours*, &c. in their own *novel devis'd terms*, which they think more proper and clear, and say, are equivalent to *his*, (but being wholly ignorant of the subject, cannot know what terms are more or less proper) nay to anathematize and persecute all that assent not thereto? Verily, you insinuate no honour to your cause by such an untoward representation! You own yourself blind, and yet you force your neighbours to take you for their guide: therefore, I conclude, man is not so incapable of God's revelations, as a blind man of knowing and using the Sun's light; and I'll suppose you pretend greater incapacity in men, and less benefit from revelation there-

thereupon, than is true or fit, merely to cover your own errors; and feign yourself blind, that you may be excus'd in holding contradictions. The blindness itself, as I have shewn, does not constrain us to take that for no contradiction in one nature, which is evidently and truly so in another, as you pretend.

After this absurdity of yours had been expos'd as ridiculous, you would fain hook me into your company to take share, calling spectators to see *P. 4.* me confessing what I had ridicul'd. But why so? Did I say a contradiction may sometimes be no contradiction? No. I had granted, say you, there may be something attributed to one nature, where there is nothing inconsistent or contradictory to it; while, if attributed to another, it might meet with something inconsistent; whence a contradiction will arise in the one, and not in the other: And so I say still; only I added what you omit, that one of the two terms of a contradiction is not the contradiction, but both together are, and are so in any nature. And now let as many as you will see if I say what you had said. Is this all one, to say, that a contradiction (which is two inconsistent propositions) is sometimes no contradiction, which is what you said; and that one of the propositions alone is no contradiction, which is what I said? Do I, that say, dependence and derivation of being is no contradiction, when said of a creature, where is nothing repugnant, say the same as he, that say such dependence and derivation may be no contradiction, when said of the independent self-existent God, and First Cause, where the other repugnant term is found? As mutual blows make the fight, so two repugnant terms make the contradiction; and this I say still, on sure grounds, is always absurd, say it of what nature you will.

A Vindication of the Remarks,

Well, but if I did not say what you said (because you are resolv'd we shall agree) you say you meant the same as I say: That *this is all you contend for, and you desire no more.* But this is not all you contended for, you *said more*, in saying, *a contradiction in one nature may be none in another*: nay, you *meant more*, if words can shew your meaning, by your instance of going *two* yards as soon as *one*; i. e. to go but one yard, and yet *more than one* at once. This is your resemblance, how a contradiction in one case may be none in another; that is, *two* contradictory propositions may become not contradictory, as if the verity of propositions could be chang'd. Nay, I must add, that this is not *all you desire*, for your argument *needs more* to defend it against the Unitarians.

You know they don't deny that some things may be contradictions, if affirm'd of men, which are none when said of God; as to be *eternal*, or *infinite*, is not, with *them*, a contradiction when said of God, because 'twere so if said of man. You were not so weak to argue for what they always asserted; contrariwise, you did suppose the Socinian to charge you with holding two opposite repugnant propositions, viz. That God is *unoriginate*, and yet a *derived nature*; is the *first cause*, and yet has a father and a *cause*, (as the Greek fathers express of the Son;) that he is but *one be*, and yet *three be's*, &c. Now that such sort of contradictions, if real, can ever be true, you affirm'd, but I never said; and therefore pray don't call me any more to be your voucher in such a case; for you certainly intended more than I said or you pretend: and 'tis incumbent on you, either to shew that these are no contradictions, which they object for such, or that they are not chargeable on your *faith*; or if they

they be real contradictions, which cleave fast to you, yet there is no absurdity in them, because contradictions (*i. e.* two opposite propositions) may sometimes be none, or not opposite; and that *to be*, and *not be*, may sometimes be the same. And then you'll do more towards the reconciling the *Gallican* and *English* churches, than if their *two synods had sat at the same time*, or than is done by the author of the *Regale*, &c. Transubstantiation will then be a credible mystery!

And now since I said nothing that has any likeness to what I expos'd in yours, you need not pretend to wonder, how I can deny, *that what is a contradiction in one nature, may yet be none in another*. I should wonder more, if I did not deny such an absurdity.

Your other instance, which you complain was not taken notice of, *viz.* That *'tis no contradiction for all things to be present with God, tho it be a contradiction to men that the past or future things should be present*, is to the same purpose as the rest: for in one sense 'tis no contradiction to either, *i. e.* for a past thing to be *objectively present* in the idea, and so it may be with man; and in another sense 'tis a contradiction in both, *i. e.* to behold that as *actually doing now* which is past: for so God himself does not behold the original *chaos*, as now actually existing void of form: nor does he judge *Adam* and *Eve* to be now in their first innocency. I doubt some are fond of making abundance of needless contradictions, on purpose to keep some *darling absurdities* of their own in countenance. But tho I am not so vain as to pretend to reconcile all difficulties, or to say which side is wrong, much less to fathom the *boundless perfections* of my glorious Creator; yet I think it is no arrogance to say, that I am sure both sides of a problem, or real contradiction,

tion, cannot be true, about any object; or if they may be both true, and a contradiction in one case be none in another, why will you not have a little charity, and allow that the *Unitarians* and you don't contradict each other? But tho, in some cases, 'twould be a contradiction to affirm and deny the same thing; yet of the *divine nature* to do thus, may possibly be none; and so we are good friends.

P. 4.

Your next refuge is, That *the nature of God being incomprehensible, we must not object contradictions in it, from comparing it with our own, because we understand not his nature.* To this I said, it might have some fair pretence, if we had no knowledge at all about it; but that we have so much knowledge, tho' partial, as warrants us to deny what is contradictory to it: hence we justly deny many things for being incompatible to the divine attributes, to his spirituality, goodness, &c. And why may we not as well discern what is contradictory to the divine unity, which is as manifest as the others? You reply, That *the attributes and nature are different; and this is a dispute not about God's attributes, but his nature, of which we are totally ignorant; that 'tis utter darkness to us, &c.*

I might answer you, That *essential* attributes, or perfections, are the *very essence* under so many various inadequate conceptions; that God is not compounded of essence and perfections, as of different things, but that his very nature is goodness, power, wisdom, &c. But I will not obscure my argument, by entering on *metaphysical* niceties. I have enough to say without this: for supposing what you crave, there may be good ground to object contradictions in this case; for, 1. The divine *unity* is one of his attributes by consent of all, and so may be argu'd about,
and

and contradictions may be discerned and objected here as well as in other attributes. And, 2. Were it otherwise, yet may contradictions safely be started and discerned about even the divine nature, on these accounts.

1. 'Tis sufficient for this, if I but know what God *is not* in any respect. All allow one way of knowing God is *per viam negationis*, by denying of his nature every thing that argues imperfection. Now if I do but know what God certainly *is not*, I may then object against any thing, that in contradiction thereto does affirm him to be what I know he is not. Thus, if I know that *derivation of being* from any other cause is what cannot belong to the first supreme nature, I may justly object contradiction to those who shall affirm this unoriginate nature to have a *cause*. If I know his *nature can be but one*, I object soberly against them that shall say, there are *many* supreme divine natures. I will object against all imperfection, as a contradiction to that *ever-glorious Jehovah*: and I must know, in some instances, what is imperfection, else I shall not know but God may be *mutable* and *mortal in his nature*, if I cannot know that these are imperfections.

2. If I know but any property or perfection of his nature, I may know that to be a contradiction to his nature, which denies that perfection or property. If I know he is a *necessary eternal being*, I know well that he is of a nature that *cannot die*. If I know from reason or scripture that he is *all-knowing*, I know 'tis a contradiction to say of him, who *is that nature*, that he is ignorant of any one thing. Nay,

3. If I knew neither what he *is not*, nor what any perfection of his nature *is*; yet if I knew but what is a contradiction in the nature of the thing,

thing, and to itself, I may safely say 'tis a contradiction when apply'd to God, because 'tis so in itself. Thus *to be* and *not be* at once, to be but *one single person*, and yet *three* such persons, being repugnant, may safely be objected for a contradiction, without any regard to the nature 'tis apply'd to, because of the mutual repugnancy of the two propositions, which always destroy one another, and cannot be said of the same thing. So that I don't, in this case, object a contradiction in God, from a supposition that his nature is resembled by mine, but from the bare nature of a contradiction. I may doubt whether God be a pure spirit, or be only a gross body; whether my soul be material or immaterial: but leaving this still in doubt, I am sure 'tis not both *material and immaterial*. And if any one shall say, There are both *many Gods*, and *but one such God* in nature; that once he was not in being, but yet eternally was and is to come; I hope, in these cases (which are such as the *Socinians* object) one needs not stay till he knows perfectly what the nature of God is, before he pronounces them to be contradictions. And therefore 'twas not rightly said of you, *That no contradiction can be charg'd in any nature we don't understand*; especially when yourself had granted to the *Socinian*, *That it is a contradiction to say, three persons (in God) are but one person*; which, I represented to you, was what the *Socinians* charg'd your scheme with: and therefore you were bound (but wou'd not attempt it) to shew, that this contradiction is not chargeable upon you; instead of which you cry, a contradiction in man may be no contradiction in God, when 'twas granted them, that this were a contradiction even in God.

Having made it appear, that our ignorance of the incomprehensible God, does not render us wholly

Dial. 1.
P. 7.

wholly incapable of discovering certain contradictions in men's notions of him, I may conclude you have not taken an effectual course to convince the *Unitarians*, by saying they must not argue from contradictions. So that the matter rests as at the end of the *Remarks*, viz. that it will be expected you shall shew that those and the like difficulties, objected by *them*, are either not contradictions, or not truly charg'd on *your* faith of a Trinity in God. If you go on to appear so willing to allow them those two points, I dare say you'll gain no ground.

Besides, let me add these remarks:

1. That you have laid a fair foundation for *Scepticism*: for nothing can be said of God, tho' most absurd, which on your principles can be confuted; because not knowing his nature, we must not say any thing is a contradiction to it. Nay, since you say we know not the *nature of man* (perhaps he may be three persons and one man) *nor of trees, or a pile of grass*, we cannot then urge contradictions about them, and so cannot argue about the nature of any thing; since all arguments tend to shew a contradiction in what we argue against, and so we can prove and be certain of nothing.

Nay, we cannot confute *Transubstantiation*, for we know not the *nature* of bread and flesh (for sense cannot reach that) and so may not object contradictions in the case.

Nay, you can't confute a *Socinian* this way; for you can't tell whether a denial of a Trinity be not consistent with a Trinity according to you, because this is about the *nature of God*; and not understanding that, we must not object contradictions here. How know you that God is not *three essences and one person*? The Scrip-

A Vindication of the Remarks

ture says not expressly, either this or the contrary.

2. You can never justify any long *creeds*, or explications of the Trinity, &c. in other words than scriptural: for how shall men believe your pretences of humility, that you can't comprehend God, when at the same time you are for explaining his nature in unintelligible terms, *novel*, and more obscure than the Scripture? If you don't know the divine nature, then be silent about it. How dare you say this or that is equivalent to the Scripture-terms, or *more proper*, when that is to be judged of by the nature of the (unknown) subject? But you are for explaining the text, and urging that it must have *this and that* sense; sometimes it must be *figurative*, and sometimes *literal*; and are for skrewing reason as long as you can hold it, and then run to mystery, when reason and scholastic wit are spent; and tell your adversary, he must not argue about the incomprehensible God; as if you meant, that you may reason, but only 'tis not fit for a *Sacanian's* reason to meddle; it must be, because their reason is of a lesser size.

Nay, is it any great sign of *humility of reason*, to be so *confident* of your *deductions*, as to oppress or anathematize such as testify their dissent from them; tho they assent to the text whence you pretend to infer 'em? And how know you whether their sense and inferences or yours be truest, since the terms you say are all but *allusions*, and that about a nature you know nothing of? Of all men such may seem the proudest exalters of human reason, in matters of faith, even while they decry and reproach it in their more peaceable adversaries.

3. You could not confute the Pagan notions of the divine nature your way: supposing they held

held many Gods, or that there is but one divine nature, and all the thousands of particular Gods but a *multitude of persons* in that one nature, (as you suppose many men in but one human nature) you could not confute them by the light of reason at least, because you allow not contradictions to be an argument here.

For the honour of Christianity, I beseech you, never insist on it, that to be a *Christian* is to believe, that a *contradiction may sometimes be none at all*, and that this is the only way to persuade a man to be such. I thank God I am convinc'd without it.

I shall do you no injury if I pass by your wonderful proofs for the *memory's* being *another faculty* from that by which we understand, viz. P. 5.

That the understanding is only conversant about what is *present before it*; as if we could not understand any thing that is past, and knew not formerly; or as if the idea of what is past may not become present to the understanding, which yet in the next line you own. You ask, *If the understanding forgets?* I answer, as much as *the memory*.

But I have shew'd, that three faculties in one mind is no parallel for your Trinity.

'Tis neither a mystery, nor will it resemble (what the *Unitarians* object to you) how three persons can be but one person; unless instead of three faculties making but one soul, you had shown that three faculties make but one faculty, or *three minds* but one mind. Nay, you are so tenacious, that whether there be really three faculties in the soul or not, you say it does as well for you if it be *but thought so*. Right or wrong, 'tis all one to you. You will hold to the conclusion, let what will become of the premises. This is true courage!

A Vindication of the Remarks

P. 6.

You find fault, that I will argue *strictly from the word person, as 'tis used among men*; when I only shew it does not answer the parallel in that point (of three being, but one in the same sense) for which you bring it. And since you use the word *persons* for explaining better the Scripture-language, you must suppose it to be more proper and less ambiguous; and till you give another sense, I must understand it after the known use of it. You add, *If he wou'd apply the word Father so, and the words repent and grieve, that are said of God, what work wou'd he make? &c.* As to the first term, I see nothing absurd in it. For the other terms of *repent*, &c. the nature of the subject bids me give 'em a figurative sense, and I shou'd not dare use 'em of God, if the Scripture had not done it, which is not your case; much less wou'd I put 'em into my *explicatory creeds*. But if at the same time the *Athanasians* wou'd publicly declare, they no more believe *three persons to be in God, than that God can repent or grieve properly*; and wou'd give us another fair and open sense of the terms, as of the other, that may comport with the Scripture-account of God, of his son Jesus Christ and his Holy Spirit, and with the rest of their scheme, then you might have some pretence for talking thus. But if you assign to the *Sacred Three* all the various parts and distinctions of persons in a proper sense, and for that reason do give them these characters; how can considering men think, you don't design by it to give 'em an idea of three *proper persons* in one eternal *He*? And you yourself deny the *expressions are figurative*, speaking of such texts as are alledg'd for a *Trinity of persons*.

P. 25.
Dial. 1.

P. 6.

You are mistaken, in saying, *I raise difficulties how a begotten being can be God, from gross conceptions*

ceptions of begetting after the manner of men. I never had a thought of more than of a Being deriv'd from another, which I think is the allow'd sense of begotten, as apply'd to the Lord Jesus, who receives his nature dependently on the Father, says Dr. Whitby on John 14. 28. speaking also the sense of the antient Fathers: So that the difficulty is no other, than how a deriv'd dependent Being can be the supreme God; which the Unitarians insist much upon.

You having illustrated the co-eternity of the Son with the Father by this, that the light is as old as the sun, tho the effect of it; I reply'd, That the light is really the sun itself. Upon which you set up a hideous cry, as if I were bringing the whole sun upon your head, and fetching it out of the firmament; even all that huge sun, that is so many times bigger than the whole earth: For, say you, By which we see the very sun, so many times bigger than the whole earth, can creep thro a cranny, and be all of it in this room, and in a thousand other places at once. This will help transubstantiation. Again, if the light be the star, then the very star strikes on the eye; and then you crow merrily: Let him consider on whose side the poor philosophy and shallow reasoning lies. It seems, you imagine, the sun is not made of parts; and that if the sun shines into a room, it must quit the firmament, and must come down, all or none. I can't breathe in the air, I warrant you, without being so unmerciful as to sup it all up; nor say, I stand on the earth, unless I cover it all over, from east to west. You cannot believe any subtil streams, or effluvia of light, that are a part of that huge luminous mass, which penetrate small pores of bodies. I did not say every stream of light was the whole sun, or that the parts that are above are beneath. But I fancy you hoped to find an instance from me,

how a contradiction in one case, may be none in another: the *whole huge sun in a little cranny!* Ah *this subtle Socinian!* as you call me. Thus you deride me to your cost, as *Lactantius* did the *Antipodes*, for going with their heels uppermost.

I heartily wish, Sir, you would entertain the *Coffee-houses* for one year with a *course of your philosophy*, I dare promise you many admirers; and when that has prevail'd, no doubt but your divinity will go off.

Dial. 2. All the answer you give to the objection against three persons in God, from his being spoken of singularly, as *I, Thou, He*; is that in the first of *Genesis*, &c. God is spoken of plurally; for instead of *God created*, you say, it is *Gods he created*; That three persons are mention'd, the *Father, Word* (because God spake, and speech contains words) and *Spirit, and these Gods made*, &c. So that if plurality be express'd, as you say well, it is a *plurality of Gods*; if the singular be *God*, the plural is certainly *Gods*. Pray stick to that. 'Tis an obvious reply to this, that 'tis an usual *Hebraism* to put the *plural* for the *singular*; and so princes and others say *we*, when 'tis but *one*. You say, indeed, that, in the royal language, Dial. 5. *we* notes the King and *his council*; as if *our royal pleasure*, and *we command*, did relate to any but himself. But to silence you once for all in this matter know that this plural term *Gods, Elohim*, is said of one of the persons alone; Psal. 45. 7. *Thy throne, O Gods, is for ever and ever*: And, Heb. 1. 9. *O Gods, thy Gods have anointed thee*, which the Apostle applies to Christ. Now unless the *Son* have another Trinity in him, the *plural* word can't intend three persons here, but one, only it is more majestic.

But

But what must we say to this, that in the New Testament (the proper place for this article) there is not so much as one such expression, but always *be* in the singular? It had been meet to shew where many persons ever use the diminutive language *I* and *me*; which you aim at, in telling us, that 'tis said of a King, *he marched*, &c. when it means *all his army*: but tho it supposes all the army, it does express the King alone, and his authority, and therefore is singular; for if three princes together have the command, it would no longer be, *he march'd*, but *they*, which shews you are out: So that the objection (with the greatest part of the remarks) lies on your hands still.

As for your comments on other texts, they are arrows shot at *no mark*, till you state your notion, whether *three infinite minds*, or but *one*. Your expositions are precarious, or go no higher than *Arianism*, or are obviated oft in the *Soci-nian* comments; and in answering *their* texts you are as modest (on *John* 17. 3. *1 Cor.* 8. 5.) as if you said nothing. Pray, Sir, tell us whereabouts your answer is to the text, *Of that day knows none, but my Father only*, which some cannot find among your answer'd texts; and yet it was in that *little book*, which is all that you venture to attack, and no text is more urg'd by the *Unitarians*. Pardon this freedom, Sir, in pursuance of your *desire to hear from me again*; who, I assure you, am acted herein by no passion, except it be a passionate desire of seeing our holy Christian Religion rescu'd from the burden of *contradictions*.

But what must we say to this, that in the New Testament (the proper place for this article) there is not so much as one such expression, but always be in the singular; it had been more to show where many persons ever use the demonstrative language I and we; which you say is, telling us, that "the Lord of Kings" is wanted, &c. when it means all his army: but this it happens all the army, it does express the King alone, and his authority, and therefore is singular; for if there princes together have the command, it would no longer be "the Lord of Kings," which shows you are out: So that the objection (with the greatest part of the remarks) lies on your hands still.

As for your comments on other words they are arrows shot at us and A. all you state your notion, whether there be a mind, or not. Your expressions are precisions, or go no further than "mind," or are obtained out of the text when comments; and in answering these texts you are as usual (on John 17: 3. 1 Cor. 13: 2) as if you said nothing. Pray Sir, tell us what about your answer is to the text, O that we knew thee, but my Father knew, which some can not find among your answers & texts; and yet it was in that text, which is all that you venture to attack, and no text is more urged by the adversaries. Pardon this freedom, Sir, in substance of your paper to bear your own weight, what I allure you, and acted herein by no passion, except it be a passionate desire of seeing our poor children rescued from the burden of popery.

CONTENTS

SECT. I.

The true state of the question relating to Christ's satisfaction.

SECT. II.

Examination of the satisfaction, not necessary in order to pardon. Not from the nature of God's justice. Not from the testimony of the law.

EXAMINATION

OF

Mr. Leslie's Last Dialogue,

Relating to the

Satisfaction of Jesus Christ.

Together with

Some Remarks on Dr. Stillingsfleet's
True Reasons of Christ's Sufferings.

1708.

C O N T E N T S.

S E C T. I. p. 44

The true state of the question relating to Christ's satisfaction.

S E C T. II. p. 47

Equivalent infinite satisfaction, not requisite in order to pardon. 1. Not from the nature of God's justice. 2. Not from the threatenings of the law. 3. Not from the ends of government.

S E C T. III. p. 60

That Christ did not make such satisfaction. 1. He did not suffer proper punishment. 2. It was not a full equivalent to strict justice.

S E C T. IV. p. 72

Christ's being styled a sacrifice, a propitiation, or atonement, no proof of such a satisfaction. 1. They were rites of humble deprecation. 2. Legal atonements were sometimes so made as to have no shadow of punishment. 3. Even the bloody sacrifices were rather penitential than satisfactory.

S E C T. V. p. 80

Supposing an equivalent punishment had been requisite, yet it would not thence follow, that it must be infinite. 1. Because sin, tho exceeding evil, is not infinite. 2. Infinite satisfaction cannot be made by infinite punishment.

S E C T. VI. p. 83

According to the common scheme of satisfaction the Second person in the Trinity is still unsatisfied.

S E C T. VII. p. 89

The Socinians grossly misrepresented by Mr. Leslie: The Trinitarians sadly divided in their notions: The injustice of denying toleration to the Unitarians.

A LETTER from the Author in answer to some questions proposed to him on this subject. p. 102



*An Examination of Mr. Leslie's
last Dialogue, relating to
the Satisfaction of Jesus
Christ.*

S I R,

I MAKE bold to present you with my thoughts on your last dialogue, relating to the *satisfaction of our Lord Jesus Christ*, in opposition to the *Unitarians*; and shall examine what pretence you have from thence to infer his supreme deity; For as to the rest the *Unitarians* are no more concern'd in the dispute than the *Armianians*, who give the like account with them of Christ's sufferings. They can bear with any notions here, which don't subvert the justice of God, or sully the glory of his free grace in the pardon of sin: But they stiffly deny any just inference to be made, from the true account of the atonement of sin by Jesus Christ, for his supreme deity, which is what you and others drive at: you telling us, That *the doctrine of the satisfaction is built upon the Trinity, and divinity of Christ*; that *if he were not God as well as man, he could not satisfy*, &c. This is the common plea, but of what weight it is, will be seen by what follows.

As

As to your management of the argument, I doubt whether any who were hearty in the cause ever prosecuted it, either more feebly or more unfairly; for what no Socinian would ever say, nay what he expressly denies, you put into your Socinian's mouth, and make him speak what you found in Trinitarians books, because you judg'd it might be odious. The most pinching and obvious argument which the Unitarians insist on, viz. the inconsistency of a strict *equivalent* meritorious *satisfaction*, with free *gratuitous* pardon, you are so ignorant or disingenuous, as never once to mention; and yet you have the vanity to tell the world, you have considered the chief of the Socinian *Traacts*, when you have only attack'd one very little one, which for your own glory you must call *that most celebrated book with them*. To me it appears, that you have but just dip'd into the controversy, and don't so much as understand the true *state* of it. In order to shew your defects, I shall *first* state the matter in dispute; and then shew how short you are of proving your point against the Unitarians.

SECT. I.

The true state of the question relating to Christ's satisfaction.

AS to the matter in dispute, I will not lay weight upon words and phrases, that may have various and uncertain meanings. The term *Satisfaction*, in a legal sense, is wholly unscriptural. I think you are not quite so happy as ridiculous, in pretending to discover it in *Isa. 53. 11.* which I think none before ever did; and I fancy none after you will interpret of a satisfaction to *justice*, when it plainly speaks of a complacential

placental delight the servant of God should have in the issue of his undertakings. But any jingle of words serves some men, but the sense be ever so foreign to their purpose; however, neither the unscriptural term *Satisfaction*, nor the scriptural terms *Redemption*, *Propitiation*, *Atonement*, *Sacrifice*, &c. is the matter of this dispute: the Unitarians can allow all these; and the very *Racovian catechism*, which you say is their standard, expressly allows *Jesus Christ* to be our expiatory sacrifice, Chap. 8. and that in the same sense as, say, in a faller than the sacrifices under the law were such. So that they have said what is false, who tell the world, that the Socinians in general deny Christ died a proper sacrifice for sin; much less do the *Arrian* Unitarians decline the expression. Nor shall the phrase of *agere loco*, or his dying in our stead, make any difference, so that the *Antinomian* sense of his sustaining our legal person be excluded. The *Racovian catechism* asserts it, that Christ died as *victima suadamea*. And I think he that suffers with a design to prevent our suffering (which is granted) truly suffers in our stead.

But the true state of the question is about the meaning of the aforesaid expressions, viz. Whether or not our Lord *Jesus Christ* endured such infinite punishment at the hands of God, as was a full equivalent compensation to vindictive justice for the sins of men, and strictly meritorious of their pardon. It must not only be punishment, but equivalent to all that a world of sinners had deserved at the hands of severe justice for ever: and in order to this, it must be infinite in value; for no other notion of Christ's satisfaction can afford you so much as a pretence of an argument for his infinite Deity. Therefore you call it infinite satisfaction, p. 2. as do Dr. Edwards and others.

If

If it was proper punishment laid on Christ, yet if that was not a full *equivalent* in strict justice; nay, if 'twas an equivalent, yet if that equivalent did not amount to *infinite*, then not being infinite satisfaction, it needed no infinite person to make it; and so your argument for Christ's Deity will fail here.

The *Unitarian sense* I take to be this, That the Lord Jesus, not so much by any *physical* virtue of his blood, or by the natural pain and torments of his sufferings, but by his *obedience to the death of the cross*, by his great patience, humility, submission towards God, and transcendent charity to men, (express'd chiefly in his sufferings, which were the great trial of those virtues) did make so acceptable and *rewardable an oblation to God*, that in consideration hereof he is exalted to be a princely advocate with a merciful God for sinners; and in the acceptable virtue of this obedience to death, his intercession is prevalent with the divine mercy for *pardon*, which he is authoriz'd to grant. *The ground of pardon being granted in his name*, is his *obedience*, which is better than a bare external sacrifice: 'tis not merely a condition, as Dr. *Stillingsfleet* pretends, in his *reasons of Christ's sufferings*, but a rewardable consideration in the case of pardon; as a perfectly holy life would be a meet consideration for God's gracious recompence of eternal happiness. *The way of its application* is by his intercession, not challeng'd of rigorous justice as a thing strictly merited, and which God, having had the full worth of, is bound in justice to grant as a debt he owes to the purchaser; but sought of the divine favour and mercy, with which Christ's obedience has given him so great a prevalency. And herein they see the wisdom
of

on the Satisfaction of Jesus Christ.

of God highly manifested, in putting this honour on Jesus Christ for his consummate virtue, that pardon and salvation shall, thro' his mediation, be given to them, who by him (by his law and example) are brought to turn from their sins unto God; and also in making it serve as an humbling memorial of our own unworthiness and distance, in being admitted to favour by the interposal of one of the highest virtue and worth; and this tried to the utmost by the most difficult exercises. And in order to such atonement and pardon by Jesus Christ, they see no need of his being supreme God.

S E C T. II.

Equivalent infinite satisfaction not requisite in order to pardon. 1. *Not from the nature of God's justice.* 2. *Not from the threatnings of the law.* 3. *Not from the ends of government.*

HAVING thus stated the case, I am next to shew how short you are of proving your point against the Unitarians, viz. of an *equivalent infinite satisfaction* to God's vindictive justice, in order to pardon. The method of your (and others) arguments takes in these four things: (1.) That divine justice necessarily requires *such satisfaction* in order to pardon sin. (2.) That Christ has made it, by suffering such equivalent punishment. (3.) That this equivalent can be no less than *infinite* punishment and satisfaction. (4.) That hence it follows he must be an *infinite* God. Let's examine them singly.

1. You assert, that the justice of God obliges him to *exact the utmost punishing*; i. e. to punish *Not from the nature of justice.*

P. 5.

P. 47.

P. 31.

to the utmost what every sin strictly deserves, and that God cannot pardon sin till he has executed his vengeance *somewhere* or other to the full. And on this it is that your party build the necessity of *infinite* satisfaction in order to pardon. You ask, *Does justice require full satisfaction?* and are so disingenuous as to make your Socinian answer, *Yes*; when no Socinian will ever say it in the sense your question intends, but on the contrary they would always say, *No*. You say, *Justice can no more remit the least farthing, than it can cease to be*: that justice not being *satisfy'd*, justice is not done, and that is injustice. This you assert, but don't prove. But so far is this from belonging to the nature of divine justice, that I dare say no just and good man ever acts thus, always to demand inexorably the utmost of his strict right. The *Summum Jus* is ever blamed, as is he who is righteous overmuch.

'Tis granted by the Unitarians, that punishing justice belongs to the great Governor of the world, and that 'tis requisite it should be exerted, tho not always answerably to the strict demerit of sin, yet answerably to the ends of government; and so 'tis in all regular human governments. Accordingly God does exert this *punishing justice* in many temporal punishments, and more fully in the final condemnation of the *incorrigible*, in the day of the revelation of the righteous judgment of God.

But justice does not demand the same punishment of the *penitent*, who do honour to it by their repentance, and their humble earnest deprecation of deserved wrath: but by your principle, God is bound to punish the sins of the most penitent, as much as those of the most haughty obstinate transgressors. He must not remit a farthing in one case, and he can have no

more than every farthing in the other. In short, I say, God always hates sin, but is not bound always to punish it, only when in his wisdom he sees it requisite. And in this Dr. *Stillingfleet* consents, *Preface to the sufferings of Christ*, p. 8. where he argues against your notion of divine justice as very absurd.

Your only argument, *viz.* That justice not being satisfy'd, supposes justice not to be done, and that not to do justice is injustice, arises from your confounding two different notions of justice. For a thing is said to be just in two senses: either 'tis *quod fieri potest*, what lawfully may be done; or, *quod fieri debet*, what ought to be done. Now not to do the last, that is, what ought to be done, is injustice; but to admit the former, *viz.* what I may without injustice do, is no wrong. And of this kind is God's right to punish the penitent upright servant for his hated defects and forsaken faults; this is not *quod fieri debet*. But you suppose that whatever may be done justly ought in justice to be done, which is very monstrous. For I pray what is justice? Is it not to give every one his due? 'Tis in giving, not taking, what is strictly due; giving others their right, not exacting from 'em my own; of my own I am master, but not of another's. And tho we say punishment is due to an offender, the meaning is not that he has a right to it, which in justice we must not deny him, but that the injured person has a right over him to take it if he pleases: the injured person does not come under these bonds, but the offender only; so that the injured is free in point of justice, if something else don't require him to use his power over the injurious. If a man can't part with his just right in any case without coming short of justice; then he is unjust in not

prosecuting every trespasser to the utmost lawful rigour: for here justice is not exerted. Whereas, even princes, who are trusted by the community, and should not give up their *rights*, are yet endowed with a prerogative to remit punishment, where it may safely be; and this without any injustice, tho' *justice be not done*. And dares any man say, that the absolute sovereign Lord of all shall not sometimes forbear to use his right to punish his creatures? *May he not do with his own as he lists?* Mat. 20. 15.

But if God must do all that with justice he can do, then I doubt he must needs refuse Christ's substitution; because in justice he might either not have contrived, or not accepted it; and *not to do justice is*, say you, *injustice*. And it seems strange, that in order to magnify God's pardoning mercy, you should lay your foundation in such a notion of him, as represents him incapable of shewing any mercy; and under a necessity to do all the hurt he can within the limits of rigorous justice. Nay, if God cannot part with the *exercise of his just right in any point*, (for with his *right itself* in general, I grant it) then it will follow, that he must pardon penitent sinners *absolutely*, because it is his *just right* to suspend and remit punishment when he pleases, as much as 'tis his right to inflict it when he sees that to be best. And if he must do *justice to the utmost*, i. e. whatever is just; then must he do this justice of exercising his prerogative and just right in absolute pardon, else here is some *justice not done*: so that both ways, either in punishing, or not punishing, God exercises his just right, and acts as justly in the one as the other, if we only respect the nature of mere justice.

You ask, If forgiveness without satisfaction *be called justice?* and you make your Socinian answer,

on the Satisfaction of Jesus Christ.

31

answer, *No*; when he would say, *Yes*, if he might speak for himself; but he is in your hands, and you make him speak what you would have him, to make you sport; which is the great privilege of those who write controversy by way of *dialogue*. I say then, that free pardon is *justice*, as our alms is called *righteousness* in Scripture; for this reason among others, say some, because they must be given of such things as we have a *right* to: so God's pardoning mercy is *righteousness*, as much as his bounty is so, as being the exercise of his *just* right. Punishing is one act of justice, and pardoning another; either way God uses his own right with equal justice. So that you give no manner of proof of its being essential to justice, that it must always punish to the utmost desert. And indeed since *forbearance* is a real remission of all that punishment which the sinner might have suffered in that time, you may as well say, that *justice is not done* in God's long forbearance of the wicked, as in his absolute pardon of the penitent; nay, in his *forbearance of devils* too, on whom justice is not fully executed yet, but they are forgiven a great part of their torment till the last day: and yet this is without any satisfaction, unless you suppose Christ satisfy'd so far for devils too.

And as *your ground* for the necessity of full satisfaction fails, *viz.* from the *nature of God*, and his justice; so I suppose will *theirs*, who found the necessity of full *penal satisfaction* upon the threatnings of the law, as *some*; or upon a regard to the ends of government, and the common good; as *others*.

2. I find even some rigid *Calvinists* will not go so far as you, to lay this necessity so boldly on the *nature of God*, but only on his voluntary determination. Not from the threatnings of the law.

Treat. of
Redemp.
P. 93,
144.

determination. *The injustice of not punishing any sin* (says Dr. Owen) *arises not from any natural obligation, but from a positive act of God's will.* This positive will being supposed to be declar'd in the threatnings of his law, before man sinned, let us examine what necessity of full penal satisfaction is manifest from the *threatnings of the law.* Tho, I think, this founds the satisfaction originally on *mere will and dominion*, which made a necessity that did not arise from any *natural obligation*; and therefore 'twill be a great presumption against this opinion, that 'tis not likely a most gracious God should exert such a positive act of mere will; yet I find no such thing in the *law* itself. The threatning was, *Thou shalt die*; and the sentence pass'd upon him in pursuance of that law was, *Thou shalt return to the dust.* And this is fully executed on men themselves; so that there is no need for a *substitution* or satisfaction to take it off: and 'twill be very hard for men to suppose a secret meaning of that threatning, *viz.* that it includes eternal torments, and then upon that supposition to suppose a necessity of a full execution of that meaning of the threatning on every sinner.

Gen. 2.
17.
Chap. 3.
19.

But as I will not deny, that the continuance under death was imply'd in that sentence; so I judge, that whatever *future miseries* might be imply'd in that threatning, (as I grant they are in others) yet threatnings, consider'd barely in themselves, do not bind the lawgiver, in strict justice, to inflict 'em on every sinner who repents. For even the sentence of *returning to dust* was not executed on *Enoch* nor *Elias*; nor will it be on those *who shall not sleep, but shall be chang'd.* Who knows but the threatnings of the first covenant were as conditonal as to future miseries (supposing them intended in *Gen. 2. 17.*) as the threatnings

1 Cor. 15.
51.

in the Gospel? (1 Cor. 3. 17. Gal. 5. 21. Rev. 21. 8.) These are deliver'd in as absolute terms as the *first threatning* was, and yet we say they are not intended to be executed, if there be repentance; only temporal miseries, viz. death, &c. are peremptorily determined. Perhaps God, whose merciful nature was the same at first, never dealt with *frail* man (as the history shews him to be easily ensnar'd) on other terms than these: he might threaten future miseries; but we have no reason, that I see, to say his threatnings were not conditional, and left no reserve for repentance, as now. I know a thousand precarious things are said of the *first covenant*, and *covenant of works* with man in innocency, requiring perfect obedience, as the *condition of life* eternal, and admitting *no repentance*; of which things I find not the holy Scriptures say a word: and I doubt whether *such* a covenant be either suitable to the nature of a gracious wise God, or the *nature of man*, in his unexperienc'd *feeble innocency*. Our common systems do most pitifully suppose, and then build all on this; which shou'd be well prov'd, before it be laid for a foundation. Now if the threatnings were conditional, then on repentance they were to be suspended of course without any execution due.

But if eternal miseries were threatned, and absolutely denounc'd against the sinner, yet considering what has been said of the *nature of justice*, and that *non-execution* wrongs none in their rights, (for even God's right to punish remains, tho he forbear to exercise it) I can't see any thing can be pretended for the injustice of not executing the threatning but this, that 'tis against *truth*, a wrong to the veracity of God, and a wrong to men, as 'tis a sort of justice due to them not to deceive 'em.

To which I *answer*, That whatever the certain *natural consequence* of sin may be, to render an incorrigible sinner miserable; and whatever engagements may be on the *wisdom and holiness of God*, as rector of the world; nay, whatever engagement may be upon his truth on *other accounts*, to exact the threatned punishment on the irreclaimable sinner; yet the bare threatening does not, I conceive, *engage his truth*, because threatnings are not like predictions, nor are wont to be understood to signify what shall *certainly be*, but what *may be* expected: they are not given for a pledge of the divine veracity. Death was threatned to the murderer; and yet God said to *David*, without being *false*, *Thou shalt not die*.

If the divine *truth* were at stake in every threatening, I don't see but the *same injustice*, *i. e.* the same untruth, might be charg'd on God still, even tho Jesus Christ had suffer'd the equivalent; because the law or threatening did never say, that Christ, or *some substitute*, should die, but the sinner. And there seems to be as little punctual truth observ'd in Christ's suffering the punishment instead of the sinner, as in God's pardoning him absolutely; for when Christ suffer'd, it was neither the same person, nor the same kind of punishment that the threatening spake of. And if it be a right notion of Dr. Owen, that *personal guilt* differs from debts in this, that the *person himself is principally intended, and aimed at*, and not the debt; then it will follow, that the threatening was not accomplish'd in its principal intention, when Christ suffer'd; and then where is the *truth* of the threatening accomplish'd? Justice may admit an exchange, but *truth* lies in a point. Thus if I tell my creditor I am worth a thousand pounds in land, and it be found, that

I am worth it only in cattel, or shipping, I may seem *just enough*, and my credit is altogether as good, but I shall be counted a lyar; so that the equivalent does not answer the truth. Yet I suppose the *divine truth* is as exact as *his justice*. Wherefore I conclude, that there is no necessity, either upon the *justice* or *truth* of the most holy God, that he must always execute the utmost of his threatnings on all sinners, even the most penitent. 'Tis enough that he uses his right or not, as in his infinite wisdom, goodness, and sovereignty he judges best.

3. I find most of our considerate late writers *Not from the ends of* do lay the necessity of Christ's satisfaction on the regard that is due to the *ends of government*, and the common good of men, by deterring men from sin by this instance of punishment. Thus Dr. *Stillingfleet in his reasons of Christ's suffering*, p. 47, 59. *Preface*, p. 39. For tho this *Doctor* avoids saying 'twas *necessary*, yet he says, 'twas agreeable to *justice* to admit of Christ's satisfaction on behalf of the penitent, on *this* account.

But since the *ends of government*; and the means to serve those ends, consist not in a point, but admit of great latitude, I think this will devolve the matter upon the dominion and wisdom of God at last, who may chuse what way he shall take in this affair; and if he can but maintain, or has provided for the honour of his law without an *equivalent penal satisfaction*, then there is no necessity for it.

Now the *Unitarians* judge, that the honour of God, and a regard to his laws, are abundantly provided for without it, *viz.* by his limiting the *conditions* of free pardon and salvation, so that none can partake hereof but those who repent, and forsake their wickedness, and sincerely submit to his laws, while the rest are doom'd to

perish. In this are contain'd all reasonable motives to obedience, as absolutely necessary, and all possible arguments to deter us from wicked acts. *Here* is no more encouragement given men to go on in sin, than if Christ had satisfy'd for 'em; which would certainly give as much hope to the most daring and dilatory sinner: and I am confident sinners would presume as much on the satisfaction of Christ, as they do, or would do, on the free mercy of God, even while they go on in sin. And here is as much to *deter men* from sin, as if Christ had been punish'd for 'em; for I can't suppose the world will ever be made to think the sufferings of Christ for a few hours to be *more terrifying*, or to give 'em a more dreadful sense of divine wrath, than the endless horrors of hell-torments in *unquenchable fire*. If this will not deter 'em from sin, the other will not; and they have already the same grounds to believe hell-torments, as are pretended for Christ's *infinite sufferings*: nay, if they don't first believe the *wrath to come*, on the credit of the text, they'll not believe Christ suffer'd to take it off. So that it seems neither to add to the terror, nor the assurance of it, to say Christ made such satisfaction for the eternal torments due.

To which, if we add the sad abuses of the doctrine of an equivalent satisfaction by so many, to their hardning and security in sin; and also how much this doctrine seems to diminish of the glory of God's *free grace*, in unmerited pardon of the upright; it may perhaps appear, that the honour of God's government, and the ends of piety, are at least as well provided for by free pardon, as by an *equivalent satisfaction*. Certain it is, that love to God is the noblest root of all pious endeavours; and as certain that the less free grace we believe there is in God's pardon, the less we shall love him:

him: for *to whom little is forgiven, the same will* Luke 7. 47.
love but little.

Besides, it is not for us in dubious matters to say, this or that is the wisest way, therefore God must take it; there being nothing we are less proper and certain judges of, than these matters of wisdom, which require a mighty comprehension and capacity. If we must judge that to be the wisest method of divine government, which is back'd with the highest severities, and most sensible representations of God's anger, we shou'd perhaps think, that to serve the ends of government it were necessary God shou'd smite upon every presumptuous crime: for if on each wilful crime he shou'd take away a limb, or cause a paroxysm of the cholic or gout to seize the offender; and this became a certain fix'd method, that a man could not doubt of such a mark of speedy vengeance; probably this severe way might deter men more from sin than either Christ's sufferings or future torments. Yet we must not say, God uses this method, or that 'tis necessary, when we see the contrary; no more must we fancy a necessity of a satisfaction without proof. Now since there is no necessity of an *equivalent satisfaction* to be made out *à priori*, either from the nature of God's justice, from his law, or reasons of government, (which last I confess you deride) I don't see but pardon, or not punishing, is a matter of God's *dominion*, but always under the conduct of wisdom, holiness, and goodness; and therefore is gratuitously exercised on an *umble penitent*, where it may be so without any prejudice to the interest of true piety, and I think without any absurd consequence.

I wonder to find Dr. *Stillingfleet* object so weakly against this dominion in pardon, which the
Unitarians

Christ's sufferings, Unitarians assert: If, says he, *the whole right of punishment depends on God's dominion, then all sins must have equal punishment.* This is a very strange inference, that because God *may* punish as he pleases, therefore he *must needs* punish *all alike*, and observe no proportion of fault and punishment. And yet in the same breath he adds, *Then it were at liberty for God to punish a greater sin with less punishment, and a less with greater.* This is still more strange, that two such contradictory consequences should follow from the same premises, *viz.* both that *all punishments must be equal*, and yet that they *may be unequal*. He goes on; punishment wou'd then be a *mere arbitrary thing, depending on the mere will of God*. No more I think than in his preface he had made it to be; nor is it *mere will*, but attended with wisdom, holiness, and equity in all its determinations. He adds, that then *God may punish whom he pleases*, (he means any innocent man) and wonders that the Socinians, who assert *the right of punishment to be merely in God's dominion*, should cry out of the *injustice of punishing one person (Christ) for the faults of another*. And tho he produces this as their reason, and I think a very good one too, *viz.* that *punishment supposes guilt*; and so restrains his dominion in punishing to the guilty only: yet the Doctor will have it, that they *contradict themselves to serve an hypothesis*, in saying that God may by his dominion forbear to punish a guilty man, and yet that he cannot extend his dominion to the punishing an innocent man; notwithstanding the Socinians never pretend God's dominion gives him right to punish all that are under it, but only *the guilty*; and that among them his dominion gives him a right also not to punish where he sees that best.

on the Satisfaction of Jesus Christ.

59

I think if the *Unitarians* be rightly understood, the matter is very clear; they'll grant that *right to punish* is founded on *dominion*, but yet upon *justice* too. I may not be punish'd by one, merely because he is *over me*, without any *desert* of mine; so that there must be *justice* at the bottom: and yet I may not be punish'd for my fault by every one that has *no authority* over me, so that there must be *dominion* also, as the foundation of a *right to punish*. But then this being only a *right*, not an *obligation* on God, 'tis no more than a right to punish *if he will*; and consequently the *exercise of this right, or not exercise*, is a point of mere *dominion*. There must be inherent *guilt* to found a *right to punish*; but nothing but *choice* and wisdom is needful to *use it*, or to suspend its exercise. So that the *Socinians* speak very consistently, when they assert God's dominion in *free remission* of the guilty penitent, but deny it to extend to the punishment of the innocent Jesus, or any other; *i. e.* he may part with his right, and yet may not do wrong. So then if *not to punish* belong to the divine dominion, there will be no necessity of your full satisfaction in order to pardon. Nor can you argue that any such thing is at all design'd, until the divine pleasure to have it so be produc'd; because pardon may be granted by absolute unmerited remission, for ought that appears from the nature of God's justice.

And it is plain, that in human governments, thus to forgive *penal debts* to the humble relenting offenders, making a difference between a modest and an impudent transgressor, is so far from being a defect in government, that 'tis a *beautiful royalty*, and one of the greatest *graces* of dominion. Much less is it any defect in God's government, who is absolute lord of all, and who can't be impos'd on, as men may, with *shews of mock-*

mock-repentance; especially since there seem more ill consequences to follow upon his long forbearance of the obstinately vicious, than from his free pardon of the penitent: and yet even that is not too destructive a method to the ends of righteous government, to be admitted by the wise and just God every day. The *Papists* don't prove to me, that there is an *universal visible judge of controversies*, by their bold saying, that else God would not be *wise*; no more do you prove, that there is an infinite satisfaction made in order to pardon, by saying, that else God would not be just. It only shews you are very bold with God's attributes, as if you comprehended them well enough, tho the *Unitarian* must not pretend to fathom the divine *Unity*.

But because you may say, that God has taken this method of choice, to forgive upon an infinite satisfaction, and that this is enough for us to know; whether he was bound to it by justice, or not, is no great matter, if he have but determin'd upon this way; I shall therefore in the next place inquire into the truth of this assertion.

S E C T. III.

That Christ did not make such satisfaction.

1. *He did not suffer proper punishment.*
2. *It was not a full equivalent to strict justice.*

THE *Unitarians* deny that the Lord Jesus Christ is ever said, in the Gospel, to have made any such *infinite* satisfaction or *equivalent* compensation to vindictive justice, by bearing the full punishment due to the sins of men; or that any such thing is intended by his being our *ransom*,

son, or being a sacrifice for us, &c. Here two things come under consideration: 1. Whether Jesus Christ suffer'd proper punishment? 2. Whether it was a full equivalent to strict justice? 'Tis upon the latter that the main stress of the cause lies; for if only some smaller punishment was inflicted than what all sin deserv'd, it will follow that complete satisfaction to justice is not made; and so 'tis only a merciful composition made for the sinners debts, by an acceptance of less than an equivalent.

I. As to Christ's being punish'd in a proper ^{Not proper} sense by divine vindictive justice, the Unitarians ^{punish-}are afraid it will imply him to be a sinner, ^{ment.} according to their notion of punishment; which is this, *That 'tis misery inflicted by the lawgiver or ruler on a malefactor for his crime*, whereas the holy Jesus was without sin. And according to this common notion the Antinomians do rightly argue, that if the Lord Jesus was punish'd, he must first have all our wickednesses and our faults imputed to him, and be as sinful as we, which we should abhor the thoughts of; which yet their adversaries cannot answer, but by going off from the obvious and most proper notion of punishment, when they say Christ was punish'd for our sins, and by giving a more lax and mild sense of the term punishment; in which the Unitarians and they are at no great odds. They both agree in this, that vicarious punishments or sufferings are not so properly punishments, as where there is personal guilt. The judicious Mr. Hotchkis says, *Christ was not properly punish'd.* Mr. Baxter says, it was but analogically such; that is, was not truly punishment, but had a resemblance of it. See Dr. Stillingfleet's second part of *Christ's satisfaction*. And this Doctor himself, after all his vain labour to make Mr. Baxter differ from the Socinians,

Christ's
righteous-
ness, part
I. p. 77.

P. 171. *nians*, is forced to own, that Christ's sufferings were not a punishment in the most proper and strict sense.

Now the very *Racovian Catechism* says, That Christ suffered the *quasi pœnam*, that is, the *analogical* punishment of Mr. Baxter, &c. And since Dr. *Stillingfleet* himself, by punishment, means only what was appointed and accepted in order to atonement for sin; and by atonement that, in consideration of which God is willing to release the sinner on the terms of the Gospel; I don't see any mighty difference between him and the *Racovian Catechism*, which says, Our sins were the cause of Christ's sufferings in order to their pardon; *Eorum causa passus est, Et quasi pœnam in se recepit, ut nos verâ eorum pœnâ exsolveret*: and that he suffer'd for sins in the same sense that the sacrifices under the law did. Now since the Doctor and the *Socinians* agreed so well in their meaning, what reason was there to quarrel with them about the term *punishment*, of which he grants the *Scripture* speaks not a word? Indeed they observe nothing in *Scripture* of God's appointment in the case, (which the Doctor supposes and affirms) which in all solemn punishments is expected.

'Tis certain God never did appoint and order the *Jews* to shed Christ's blood; but on the contrary forbad 'em to kill him: when he sent him among 'em, 'twas to turn 'em from their sins; and the end he propos'd was this, *surely they will reverence my Son*, and not kill him, as they did his servants the prophets. And therefore to shew how they acted against his will, God censures those bands as wicked that kill'd him, and punish'd them with most dreadful but illustrious vengeance. I grant God did foresee the *Jews* malice, and deliver his Son up, i. e. he left him in their power; and it became his duty to en-
dure

dure resolutely whatever befel him in doing his
 Father's work : but still God did all, that by his
 authority and command he could, to save him
 from harm. And was this *exemplary punishment*,
 which the law-giver, instead of inflicting on him,
 did by his authority seek to cover him from?
 Certainly such a terrible solemn example of divine
 vengeance, as this is pretended to be, for strik-
 ing a terror into the whole world ; such a dire-
 ful instance of God's angry justice flaming against
 the sins of men, to affright them beyond the far
 lesser punishments of an *universal deluge*, or a
 storm of fire and brimstone, &c. I say, one
 would think such a solemn execution as this, de-
 sign'd for public warning, should have the
 plainest marks of God's hand in it. If it were
 just to inflict this as a punishment on Jesus Christ,
 no doubt God might justly have commanded the
Jews to slay him, and then it had look'd more
 like punishment ; whereas by a bare permission or
 secret will it comes to pass that the most solemn
 vindication of severe justice was made to look like
an accidental thing, and scarce to be distinguish'd
 from the ordinary trials of the Saints, as to the
ground of his sufferings, and so loses its true use.
 What public declaration is here of divine justice,
 when 'tis so hard to shew that it had any hand in
 it? Was it ever heard that a wise ruler punish'd
 one by a grievous death, for a demonstration of
 his severe justice, which death he forbids all his
 subjects to inflict ; and instead of that commands
 'em to reverence and obey him in all things?
 This would be to obscure and hide justice, in-
 stead of declaring it, say the *Socinians*.

Indeed that text, *Acts* 4. 27, 28. as translated,
 may mislead some to think, that God determin'd
 the rulers to crucify Christ ; but if the *nominative*
case be plac'd before the *verb*, as is natural, the

true order of the words will be thus ; *Both Herod and Pontius Pilate were gathered together against this holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed to do what thy hand and counsel determin'd to be done.*

The last words, *to do what thy counsel determin'd,* may relate to Christ, (see *Acts* 10. 38.) not to the wicked rulers ; for God did not determine them to murder Christ, nor was he slain by the wrath of God *his Father*, but by the unrighteous wrath of men. It would grieve one to hear such good

Remains,
p. 193.

men as Mr. *Jos. Allen* telling us of God's *cursing his own Son*, saying to him, *Go thou cursed, cursed in body, cursed in soul, &c.* Methinks tho the

Gal. 3. 13.

Jews made him a curse, Christians should not hold him *accursed* of God. The Prophet complains of the injury done him by the *Jews*, who esteem'd him *smitten of God and stricken*, 'even when he was wounded for our transgressions.

To conclude, I find God is often said to declare his *love* to sinners, in giving his Son to die for them, but never that he did it to shew his *wrath*.

Rom. 3.
25.

He declar'd indeed *his righteousness*, (or clemency, as Dr. *Hammond* on the place) but how ? not in punishing sin, but in pardoning it ; his *righteousness in the remission of sin*, which is not an act of *vindictive* justice, but of rich favour.

Mat. 26.
28.

Thus Christ *shed his blood for the remission* (not punishment) *of sin*. We are not so much as once call'd to take notice of God's severity in this affair.

But call it what you will, *suffering* or *punishment*, for our good, or in our stead ; yet if it was not a complete *equivalent* punishment, as much as the severest justice could demand, or the world's sin could deserve, 'tis nothing to your purpose of an *infinite satisfaction*. Whether it was such, or not, is the next thing to be considered.

For,

For, 2. The *Unitarians* do absolutely deny, that Jesus Christ suffer'd the *tantundem*, or an equivalent from vindictive justice, I say, *an equivalent in the sense of strict justice*; for as for a *prudential* equivalent, or rather *expedient*, such as Mr. Baxter and others are for, viz. which may answer the ends of government as much as if all men had perish'd, and which may preserve reverence for the divine law; this you call an *intrigue of politics*, and rightly add, that this *will infer no necessity of satisfaction*, i. e. adequate infinite satisfaction; for 'tis only a satisfaction to the divine will and prudence, not to inexorable justice. And the *Unitarians* will own, that God's merciful terms of pardon thro' Christ's intercession, with the sinner's repentance, is such an equivalent, or an expedient, as better answers the ends of government, and affords arguments and room for obedience, more than if sinners were left under despair and ruin.

But the question is about an *adequate* compensation to justice for sins past, not about a security for the future; or whether to answer the ends of government, and the honour of God's law, it was necessary that the utmost punishment due should be suffered without any abatement? And whether our Lord Jesus made such a full compensation, as was meritorious of our discharge from the strictest justice? For whatever is short of this cannot be *infinite satisfaction*, since 'tis not equal to the deserts of *finite demerit*.

Here then is the stress and heart of the controversy between the *Unitarians* and *Trinitarians* about Christ's satisfaction; which the former complain is not understood, at least is never attended to by their adversaries. And in this critical point, on which the whole cause depends, as Dr. Outram waves it wholly, so I think Dr. Stillingfleet, in his

Reasons of Christ's sufferings, has most egregiously fail'd; for after he had own'd that the *Unitarians* acknowledge Christ to have been an expiatory sacrifice for sin, and that they freely had told the world what were the main points in controversy, viz. 1. *Whether Jesus Christ made an adequate payment to the justice of God, or an equivalent for what men should have suffer'd?* 2. *Whether it was a satisfaction offer'd to the mercy of God, or to his justice?* I say, after this, he very subtly and unfairly drops the first and principal part of the question, saying, *The main point then between us is, whether Christ's death had respect to the justice or mercy of God;* and so runs away upon a wrong scent, straining metaphors and allusions to the legal sacrifices to little purpose, when he knew the *equivalent payment to justice*, and no other, was the main business: for if another man, or an *Angel* were appointed for a victim, this might be an oblation to justice; but not being an equivalent, you despise such satisfaction. So that the *equivalent* is all in all, in this dispute; which finding probably a little too troublesome, he had the wit to lay it aside, even tho he cites a complaint of the *Unitarians*, that *they were not rightly understood in this point*; and of himself they renew the complaint, that he would not, or did not at least, seem to understand them by his answer. So that whatever esteem some may have for his book, I can truly say, 'tis nothing to the main point, which he had once before him in his *Pref.* p. 9, 10. but left it out of his book, whether to spare his adversaries or himself, you may judge. In short, if less than an *infinite* and equivalent satisfaction might do, then one less than God might give it. I speak this over again, because men are not very willing to attend to this main point.

Now

on the Satisfaction of Jesus Christ.

67

Now that our Lord Jesus has not made *such full satisfaction as this*, the Unitarians think it prov'd from hence, that it would exclude all *gratuitous* free pardon from God; which beyond all denial is so gloriously and expressly declar'd in the *New Testa-* Eph. 4.
ment, *Forgiving one another, as God for Christ's* 32.
sake has forgiven you, ἡχαρισάτο. We are justify'd Rom. 3.
freely by his grace, thro' the redemption, &c. not 24.
only by grace, but δωρεάν, freely, without any
meritorious cause, as John 15. 25. Now how can God be said to *pardon men gratis*, if it be purchased at full price? What is there left to be remitted, if what was worth abundantly more (even sufficient for the pardon of a thousand worlds) be paid for it? He forgives all, but abates not a farthing; say you. Strange, that this should be call'd *gratuitous* pardon! I know this argument is old and common, but I never saw it yet answer'd.

It is oft said for answer, that tho Christ paid all, yet it *cost the sinner nothing*. But to whom owes he thanks for this? Is it to God, as freely forgiving him, or to Christ who paid the whole due, which otherwise had never been remitted by God? But it comes *freely to the sinner*; but, I say, not freely from God, if purchased at full worth; only from Christ. But the text says, *God freely forgives in Christ*. Well, but you'll say, it was God the Father's mercy that he found *P. 5.*
out this way of satisfaction. This is generally said, doubt, in compliment to the Father after men have dishonoured his goodness: For indeed,

(1.) It is as much the *Son's* contrivance as the *Father's*, according to your scheme, nay more the *Son's* than the *Father's*; for we are told, the Son is the *wisdom of God*; and you expressly say, *Wisdom is the second person of the blessed Trinity.* P. 5.
Now we know it is the part of wisdom to find out deep contrivances: so that the Son must be the

immediate contriver as well as executor, and no thing is left for the Father but tremendous *inexorable justice*. If you say, *mercy* put the Son upon contriving, you tell us that *mercy* is the *third person*; so that all the rich grace, that is left for the Father to shew, is only to accept a sufficient *able surety* in room of a *non-solvent debtor*, and to accept a full payment at once of what else he must ever be receiving in parts. Do you think such a thing would speak any great goodness even in a man?

(2.) But supposing God the Father finds out this expedient, 'tis not an expedient how he may *freely forgive*, but how he may be *satisfied* to *parting*. If my judge or ruler finds and persuades another to pay him my penal debt or fine, I may be beholden to him for his wisdom, and perhaps some kindness; but I'll never say he *freely forgave my debt*, which I saw paid him to the full; especially when I saw the poor man, my friend, toil and pinch, and grievously put to it to make up the sum, with tears, and sighs, and prayers that he might be spar'd. The same I would say in any other criminal case, or where ever a substitution can be admitted to give full satisfaction: whatever favour there may be, there is no gratuitous forgiveness of *all the debt*.

Dr. *Stillingfleet*, who kept as much out of the way of this argument as he could, (unable, I judge, to look this objection in the face in its full strength) at last mentions it slightly and by halves in the last leaf of the *Reasons of Christ's sufferings*. But tho he did by halves start it, I think he did not so much as half answer it. To the objection of the *inconsistency of the freeness of God's grace with satisfaction*, he answers, that *freeness of grace is consistent with conditions*; he means our *repentance and prayers*, and instances

in Abraham's prayer for Abimelech's pardon, &c. I reply, Tho' all conditions be not inconsistent with free grace, yet all strictly meritorious conditions are so; and therefore it is that in answer to the Antinomians objections, they who assert conditions of pardon, do always deny them to be meritorious, such as Christ's satisfaction is said to be. Again, says he, remission is free when the penalty is forgiven wholly, as we assert: but others say, True, 'tis free when 'tis forgiven freely, but that there is no remission, whatever you assert, from him by whom nothing is remitted, no free forgiveness at all, where all that was due was paid. If among enemies prisoners are on equal terms exchange'd, none will say they were freely released, or magnify the generosity and free grace of the enemy, that let them go on such terms, especially if ten of the other side were given in exchange for one not so considerable.

He adds, that men under defamation must vindicate themselves, tho' they freely forgive the authors of the slander: And shall not God? &c. I answer, That men may forgive, and yet seek to bring their offending brother to an acknowledgment and repentance of their fault, and to ask pardon, because this is not strict satisfaction; and this way God takes still to vindicate his honour, and forgives none who don't humble themselves and repent. But that men are bound to take the rigour of the law against their brother, or that ever they can be truly said of free grace to forgive their brother, when no submission will be accepted without the severest satisfaction to a farthing, is utterly deny'd. It was time for the Doctor to end his book here, when he could not tell better what to say to this objection, which if mention'd duly before as it ought, he might have given over sooner.

Only one thing more I find him pleading, viz. That *pardon was not inconsistent with sacrifices of atonement, and why should it be more inconsistent with the sacrifice of Christ?* I answer, It is not said to be inconsistent with Christ's *sacrifice*, but with *his equivalent meritorious satisfaction*; and therefore pardon agreed with the legal atonement because they were not a meritorious infinite *satisfaction*. And if *Jews or Gentiles had thought so* and yet own'd a gratuitous *remission*, they were inconsistent as others now are.

Nor does your notion of satisfaction seem absurd in speculation only, but also to have a very pernicious aspect upon practice; for since God's forgiveness of us is propounded as a pattern for
 Eph. 5. 32. our forgiving our offending brethren, what will the
 Mat. 6. 11. meaning of those words, *forgiving one another as God hath forgiven you*, amount to by your interpretation, but this, viz. when you have had full reparation, not abating one tittle of due rigorous punishment, and can demand no more, then forgive all the rest; only if you can procure another to satisfy you better for them, don't refuse to accept it; but else pursue them into misery, prisons, and death, as God would deal by you, unless there had been an equivalent strict satisfaction, without which, *say you*, he forgives none. It avails nothing to say that we are in a private capacity, but God is a *governor*, who must observe different methods; for since God, who is our *proprietor* as well as *rector*, forgives no other way but one, he can be a pattern to us of forgiveness in no other way but this. And thus you'll give a fine account of that great Christian precept of forgiving our brother; and instead of being *merciful as our Father in heaven is merciful*, teach us to be rigorous and severe, as one, who, besides repentance, requires the utmost punishment due, before

on the Satisfaction of Jesus Christ.

71

before he forgives. Whatever becomes of your creed in that article, *the remission of sins*, you'll give a sad exposition of the *Lord's prayer*, and of those two precepts that are the sum of the *ten Commandments*, weakning the motives of our love to God, by an horrid misrepresentation of his mercy; and of our love to our neighbour, by teaching us not to forgive, *tho he turn, and say I repent*, unless he make full satisfaction, eye for eye, or life for life. Whatever difference of circumstances there may be in the method of God's forgiveness and ours, it must not be in any thing that subverts the nature of free gratuitous pardon.

The text says indeed, *you are bought with a price*; 1 Cor. 6. but it means not any price of their pardon paid to God, but that he had bought them by his mercies; or that the favours God had expended upon them were such as did merit and purchase their service. So Deut. 32. 6. *Do ye thus requite the Lord, is he not thy Father that hath bought thee, hath he not made thee?* And thus Dr. Whitby rightly expounds 2 Pet. 2. 1. *Denying the Lord that bought them*, of God the Father, not of Jesus Christ; which some ignorantly urge against the Unitarians, as if they deny'd Christ to be Lord, and so God hath purchas'd his Church with the blood of his own Son (as it is Acts 20. 28. after some copies) or the Lord, i. e. Christ, has purchased it with his own blood, (after others) i. e. he has obtain'd a church, rescu'd them from darkness and sin, and merited that they should live to him who has died for them. I read of his redeeming men to God, but not of redeeming any from God, by giving to him a full price. Indeed the terms *redeeming* and *ransom* are seldom used in Scripture, but in the metaphorical sense, for deliverance out of trouble, without regard to the paying of a price for it. Hence Israel was redeem'd out of Egypt, Deut. 7. 8. and

Acts 7.35. and Moses was their Redeemer, *ἀγοράστης*, their Ransomer, tho he paid no price. And even where a ransom in the most proper sense is given, it does not suppose an equivalent, but whatever shall be agreed on. *Thirty shekels of silver* was the ransom of the most precious valuable life, if it happen'd to be forfeited by the law there mention'd, which was next to no consideration, if lives were as precious then as now.

Exod. 21.
30, 32.

S E C T. IV.

Christ being styled a sacrifice, a propitiation, or atonement no proof of such a satisfaction.

1. *They were rites of humble deprecation.*
2. *Legal atonements were sometimes so made, as to have no shadow of punishment.*
3. *Even the bloody sacrifices were rather penitential than satisfactory.*

SUCH satisfaction cannot be infer'd from Christ's being a *sacrifice*, a *propitiation*, or *atonement*, tho taken in the most proper sense, (he was a Priest indeed, but it was of the order of *Melchisedec*, who did not *sacrifice*, that we find, only officiated by *benediction* and *intercession*, and not of the order of *Aaron*) for I am satisfy'd the *Jewish victims* themselves, alluded to in this matter, were not design'd for a full compensation to divine justice.

For, 1. it is evident they were *rites* of humble deprecation, and a sort of *symbolical signs* of confession, that they deserv'd to be serv'd as the beasts were, while they implor'd mercy to spare them. Nor does it appear, that their sacrifices

so much as respected any satisfaction to *justice* *. What tho they were to avert God's wrath, which Dr. *Stillingsfleet* insists on? I think divine wrath may be averted by an address to mercy, and forgiveness will prevent it as certainly as satisfaction: however, it is certain there was in them an address to mercy, by which the atonement was made; for if we look to that, which was the most solemn *atonement*, which gave that name to the day on which it was made, (at which time only the High Priest was to officiate, or could be a type herein of Christ) we find that the atonement was made with sprinkling the blood seven times on the *Mercy-Seat*, within the Holy of Holies. Lev. 16. This plainly taught, that 'twas by an application to *mercy* from *justice*; 'twas mercy the High Priest fled to; and this was not only to apply the atonement made, but to *make it*. This Ver. 17. plainly figures out to us, that Jesus Christ obtains our pardon within the heavenly veil, by seeking it at the *throne of Grace*, or *Seat of mercy*. Besides this, the High Priest took incense with him, which is a symbol of *prayer*; and thus Jesus Christ still intercedes for pardon as a grant of favour, and in heaven offer'd himself, as Dr. *Whitby* shews Heb. 9. 24; clearly. 25.

Thus the Scripture is so far from appropriating Christ's atonement to his death, that it gives more *virtue* to his intercession; *Who is he that condemneth? it is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who maketh intercession for us*: His Rom. 8. resurrection being so requisite to his intercession for pardon, that the same Apostle says, *If Christ be not raised, we are yet in our sins, notwithstanding* 1 Cor. 15. ing 17.

* So Dr. *Lightfoot* tells us, the form of confession (with the Jews) over the sin-offering was, *I have sinned, I have rebelled, &c. but I return by repentance before thee; and let this be my expiation*. Temp. Sery. chap. 8, sect. 1. T. E.

ing his death: and the reason of it is, because
 Rom. 4. 25. *he rose again for our justification*, not only for a
 proof of his acceptance with God, which was for
 his *own* justification, but that he might justify *us*.
 And on this it is, that the Apostle lays the stress
 Heb 7. 25. of a Christian's hope of salvation by Christ. How
 often do we hear poor honest meaning persons ob-
 ject to the *Unitarians*, how can Christ be a Sa-
 viour if he be not supreme God? Now the Apo-
 stle, without mentioning his being God, gives a
 full answer to such, *he is able to save to the utmost*,
 says he: But how so? Wherein does his ability,
 for being so complete a Saviour, lie? *Because he*
ever lives to make intercession for them. None
 will say, that intercession is an act that none but
 God can perform; sure it is the part of an inferior
 rather. Now if his *intercession does justify* as
 well as his death, nay *rather than it*, (which
 makes me wonder how Dr. Stillingfleet could ask
 P. 299. the question, *Why are not men said to be justify'd*
much rather by Christ's resurrection? when the
 Apostle does so expressly say it, *rather he is risen*)
 then it follows, since intercession is not *penal*
satisfaction, that we are justify'd upon other
 terms.

2. Again, legal atonements were sometimes
 made in such a manner as had no shadow of
 punishment, much less of a *full* compensation;
viz. by *immolation*, or burning an *handful of meal*,
 which suffer'd no pain, and yet made as good
 an atonement for the poor, as shedding the
 Lev. 5. blood of a beast did for the rich. I know you
 12, 13. speak contemptibly of a sacrifice that had all its
 virtue from God's appointment; that God might
 P. 12. as well have covenanted to pardon man upon the
 turning of a straw, or upon the paring of a man's
 nails, as Dr. Stillingfleet speaks, p. 272. Now
 I pray consider what more worth there was in an
 handful

handful of meal: therefore what the text says, Heb. 9. 22. that under the law, *without shedding of blood is no remission*, must be taken, I conceive, with the limitation that begins that verse, *Almost all things*, &c. for here is a manifest exception from that rule. Nay, atonement was made sometimes by burning a little *incense*, Numb. 16. 47. a figure of prayer, *Psal.* 141. 2. And sometimes *prayer itself* was used for making atonement, *Exod.* 32. 30. Which shews us what it is to atone for sin; it is not to satisfy for it, but with humble penitent expressions to acknowledge guilt, and to implore mere mercy for averting deserved punishment; and this answers to Christ's intercession with God's mercy, rather than to any treating with *vindictive justice*.

3. Those legal bloody sacrifices themselves appear to be rather *penitential* than satisfactory, and to have such sort of influence upon pardon as repentance had, which is no equivalent to justice, but an address to mercy. This I gather from *Psal.* 51. 16, 17. *David* had committed *murder and adultery*, he is anxiously distress'd for pardon; he inquires after a sacrifice for atonement, but finds none appointed in that case by *Moses's* law: What must he do? Shall he despair because he had no expiatory sacrifice? Can nothing serve for expiation but blood? Yes, says he, *the sacrifices of God are a broken heart*, i. e. they are a sacrifice of expiation, even such as the law appoints for atoning some sins, but not such as mine. And thus the Fathers (and Unitarians) allow *satisfaction to God* to be made by repentance, *Deo satisfacere liceat fide & pœnitentia*, Lactan. l. 5. c. 13. So *Tertul. Basil*, see *Seller's* remarks on *S. Cyprian's* life. And I think repentance has all in it that Dr. *Stillingfleet* says of atonement, *Chr. Suff.* p. 59. It is pain suffer'd for sin, ordain'd of God,

God, in order to forgiveness, serves the ends and honour of government; and is more strictly inflicted on us by God's command, than death was on Jesus Christ; but yet it is no equivalent payment to justice, while it is an atoning sacrifice.

Nay, I think you, Sir, make Christ's satisfaction to lie in Christ's repentance or sorrow for our sin, *viz.* in *his sense of sin proportionable to the offence*, p. 21. which you call *the utmost that justice requir'd*; tho a bare sense of the fault is no meritorious compensation to justice for an injury, it only recommends one to mercy. And you speak in this as if Christ's atonement was made rather by shedding of *tears*, than by shedding of *blood*; for the former is the more proper expression of a burden'd spirit.

P. 273. But to return to *David's* sacrifice of a contrite heart; I find Dr. *Stillingfleet* arguing against *Crelhius* (who asserted the efficacy of the sacrifice to depend on God's appointment of it as a condition) asks, *Why were not inward sorrow for sin, and prayers and thanks rather made the only conditions of expiation, than such a chargeable service?* Now in *David's* case, under the highest guilt, it was just so; no sacrifice of blood or life was requir'd, only inward sorrow, tears, and prayers. And therefore one might have ask'd the Doctor on the other hand, if the design of the legal sacrifices was to teach the *Jews*, that no pardon could be had but upon Christ's *satisfaction*, as he intimates, then, I pray, how came it to pass, that under the guilt of the deepest dye, where pardon seems most unlikely to be obtain'd, there should be no sacrifice at all appointed, but *bare repentance* was accepted, without any bloody offering, or the help of any type to lead the thoughts to Christ's satisfaction? What, must one despair of pardon without Christ's sacrifice for lighter faults, and yet

P. 274.

yet do well without it under the damning crimes of murder and adultery? Or would God have satisfaction for, and teach men to dread lesser errors, but not gross wickedness?

In vain do some pretend to flee to the *general national atonement*, as if *these* crimes were pardon'd by it, for which no sacrifices were particularly appointed: for as great crimes require a more special repentance, so likewise a more particular solemn expiation; and it is strange if *they* should pass off slightly by a general atonement. Moreover, the sinner might die according to the law before that day came: nor could *David* say, there was no sacrifice appointed in his case, if it had been so. And *St. Paul* tells us, there were sins, from which men *could not be justify'd any way by the law of Moses*. So that repentance seems to be the only way left 'em for the expiation of the greatest guilt; which was a procedure not on the *law of Moses*, but on the principles of natural religion common to others. Acts 13. 39.

I take the matter to be thus, that the sacrifices alone did not purge the conscience, but only took away the *political guilt*, in relation to their *civil and ecclesiastical penalties*; and therefore when the crime was such as must not be pardon'd, but the sinner must be put to death, then there was no room for a *sacrifice*, because no pardon could be granted of that nature. But yet, with reference to God and a future state his pardon was still to be sought by true repentance, but without any bloody sacrifice, as typical of Christ's satisfaction. Isa. 1. 18. But where the law allow'd pardon, there sacrifice was that rite by which they sought it from God, as their *State-Ruler*: and therefore, even in the matter of *adultery*, which was by the law made *capital*, and consequently admitted no sacrifice from

David's

* The case of a bond-
maid be-
troth'd to
an hus-
band.

David, we find, that when in one case * the *same* crime, for some reasons, was not by the law made capital, then a sacrifice was appointed, see *Levit. 19. 21, 22. compar'd with Deut. 22. 24.* Which makes it plain, that *sacrifices* were used or not, according as the crimes were expiable or not in relation to temporal and political punishments, not in relation to future punishments, which is the end of Christ's sacrifice, for then they would have been most useful under the most heinous capital crimes, where we find 'em wholly excluded, because they could have no effect upon their temporal punishment; and repentance was the only refuge from future punishment.

P. 4.

Heb. 9.

Whence I infer, that tho this way of political pardon might be typical of the Gospel-way of *eternal pardon* by the sacrifice of Christ's *obedience to death*, as their *Canaan* was of our *heavenly bliss*; yet I see no manner of pretence for what you suggest, that the Jewish sacrifices of beasts derived their *worth and efficacy* for atonement from the *sacrifice of Christ*; for the great virtue of his death seems wholly appropriated to the future salvation from the punishments of the world to come. It *purges the conscience*, it effects our *eternal redemption*, and saves us from *wrath to come*; but it does not take off the *temporal punishment* of a criminal, nor reverse the just sentence of the *civil law or state*. This is not the purpose of Christ's death, to interfere with *state-judicatories*, or to save a murderer from *execution*: but it is apparent that this was the design of the *legal sacrifices*; and therefore how could they derive their efficacy from Christ's death for those effects, which the virtue of Christ's death has no influence upon? What! did Christ die to procure *state-pardons* for criminals? If not, how could *those* sacrifices, that were

on the Satisfaction of Jesus Christ.

72

were used for that end, have their virtue from *his*, which has no such virtue ascrib'd to it? Christ's virtue was of one kind, theirs of another. I wonder to see with what assurance men tell the world, that all the efficacy of the *legal sacrifices* was from Christ's death, when the Scripture says not such a word. If it had been so, sure it would have been mention'd in the epistle to the *Hebrews*, where there is no such thing, but only some *allusions* of Christ's oblation to the *legal* offerings, making the *latter* to be resemblances, types or figures of the *other*. But that might be, and yet they not have from it the least efficacy for eternal pardon; only Christ's death had the like efficacy (and greater in degree) for *eternal pardon*, as the *legal* offerings had for *temporal pardon*; both of 'em did operate after the *nature of sacrifices*, to the averting of wrath. But that the nature of a sacrifice is not to make an equivalent compensation for crimes, is seen *both* from the small value of the *Jewish* sacrifices of *beasts, incense, meal, &c.* which were not in themselves of *equal value* to the soul or life of man, nor did borrow virtue from Christ's death to raise them up to such an equivalent; and *also* from the nature of *repentance*, which is with as express design declar'd by *David* to be an atoning sacrifice, as ever Christ's death is declar'd to be such in the *New Testament*; and yet cannot be deem'd to operate, by way of full compensation to strict vindictive justice for heinous crimes. The sum of the whole is, that if repentance was as efficacious a *sacrifice* in the worst crimes, as burnt-offerings of beasts were under smaller; and yet that repentance imply'd no *equivalent satisfaction* to rigorous justice, any more than *now* it does; then it follows, that the nature of an expiatory sacrifice is not to make a full satisfaction to *strict justice*;
even

even tho mercy accept it for an *atonement*, as it did a little meal; and consequently Christ's being an atoning sacrifice does not prove he was so by such an equivalent satisfaction.

S E C T. V.

Supposing an equivalent punishment had been requisite, yet it would not thence follow it must be infinite. 1. *Because sin, tho exceeding evil, is not infinite.* 2. *Infinite satisfaction cannot be made by infinite punishment.*

LET us for argument sake suppose that such an *equivalent punishment* has been requir'd and paid by Jesus Christ, yet the *Unitarians* say even this will not suppose it to be *infinite*, or the person that paid it to be so:

1. *Because the sin to be expiated, tho exceeding evil, does not appear to be of infinite demerit.* Nothing is pretended for this, but its being against an *infinite* object; but if that makes it so, then all sin must be so for the same reason, as being against the same infinite God. But if all sins are of infinite guilt, then all must be of *equal* guilt; since no guilt can be aggravated beyond infinite, which belongs to the least sin; and equal guilt deserves equal punishment: and so there must be no difference of *crimes*, greater or less, one or many, the guilt will be the same; nor any difference of *punishments*, no *greater condemnation*, which is certainly false. And therefore if no better reason can be given to prove sin of infinite demerit than this, there is no reason to say God requires infinite punishment to expiate it.

2. They don't see it possible that there should be *infinite satisfaction* by infinite punishment; be-

cause nothing that is infinite can suffer. God is impassible, and cannot deny, or diminish himself; and suppose what union you please of the Deity to the humanity of Christ, yet as nothing but the human nature suffer'd, so that nature, with all its acts and passions, remains still but finite. He was not an infinite man, or an immense creature, by being united to God; and his suffering can hardly be counted infinite, any more than his eating and drinking; since the Deity no more suffered than it eat or drank. You may call it what you will, relatively or figuratively infinite, or by a logical communication of properties; but severe jealous justice is not to be cheated or blinded with names and terms of art, while it sees nothing truly suffers but a frail finite creature.

To talk of God's suffering, and a God punish'd, or of one person of the Trinity punish'd and cursed by one of the other, and the third helping the second to bear the vengeance of the first, is daring boldness enough, but little to the honour of God or Christianity. And at this rate the Unitarians account makes his sufferings as much infinite as yours; for they freely own a peculiar singular union of God the Father to the man Christ, who wrought his works for him. *The Father in me he doth the works,* (tho I suppose he did not suffer his pangs) and this seems as honourable and as near a relation as others pretend; and yet they don't think he is made God by being united to God.

Besides, how can one infinite sacrifice (if it be supposed) be an equivalent for so many myriads of infinite sins? as a great Prelate of the age has observ'd in one of his four discourses. Will not each crime need an infinite sacrifice? If you say one infinite is as much as many of the same kind, because it can have no addition; then you must re-

member that *one* infinite divine person is as much as *three*, and by this rule the *Unitarians* have as complete an object of their faith and worship as you. Nay, it follows, if sin be of infinite guilt, and one and many are the same, that a whole course of debaucheries should sit as easy on the conscience, as one single infinite fault: and will not this be a fine way to make your doctrine of *satisfaction* a comfortable doctrine!

P. 19, 20. You suppose there may be an infinite suffering, in which you place Christ's satisfaction, *viz.* in his having an *infinite sense of the infinite demerit of sin*; because, say you, he had an *adequate notion of God*. But this is either false, or nothing to the purpose: 'tis *false*, if you mean that he had in his *human nature* an infinite sense of sin, as you suppose, p. 21. or an *adequate notion of God*; for that his *finite mind* was not capable of finding out the Almighty to perfection: nay, 'tis *false*, if you mean it of a sorrowful sense of sin (such as your argument implies) tho' you suppose his *divine nature*; for that cannot be afflicted *penally*, or have any truly sorrowful sense. But if you mean that he had a full estimate of the demerit of sin in his *divine comprehension*, then 'tis to no *purpose* to call this satisfaction; for so had *God the Father* as large and deep a sense as Christ could have, and express'd as much grief (figuratively); and so had the *spirit* also. At this rate they made satisfaction too. So then *as man*, he had no infinite sense of sin; and *as God*, the Father had the same.

The *sum* of the arguments thus far is this: If God did not require a strict *equivalent*; if Christ did not pay such; nay, if an equivalent itself would not amount to *infinite*; then was there no need of an *infinite* person to make a *finite* satisfaction, much less to be a mediator and intercessor with divine mercy.

SECT. VI.

According to the common scheme of satisfaction, the Second person in the Trinity is still unsatisfied.

NOT content with shewing the defectiveness of your argument, the Unitarians turn the tables upon you, and from your very proof of Christ's Deity think they raise an insuperable objection against it, which runs thus: If, say they, justice be, as you speak, of the very essence of P. 31. God, and 'tis of the nature of justice, and consequently of God, to require an adequate satisfaction; then if Christ have divine justice, i. e. the divine nature, and be God himself, he must also require such satisfaction; and if he do not require it, he wants what is essential to God. No doubt you will say he is God, whatever follows. Well then, say they, is he the same just God who was offended by mens sins? or are there two Gods, one who was offended by our sins, and the other not? If he be the same God himself, then being the offended party he must receive infinite satisfaction, that is, must be as just a person as his Father. But yet since 'tis he only makes the satisfaction, it follows that he is not satisfy'd, unless he satisfies himself; which is no very terrible instance of vindictive justice.

Here then is the dilemma in which you are caught: either Jesus Christ, as God, has given infinite satisfaction to himself, which seems absurd*; or he is not satisfy'd at all, and so is not God

F 2

God

* With Mr. Tho. Bradbury the absurdity hereof is no objection at all; for, says he, *The satisfaction of Christ is an unaccountable irrational doctrine, destroys every natural idea we have*

God by *your* own account. Chuse whether of the *two* you'll take. I find you offer at *both*, because you dare not stand to either.

P. 2.

2 Cor. 5.

1. You would have it no absurdity for God to satisfy himself, and alledge vainly the Apostle's words, God was in Christ, *reconciling the world to himself*, (*i. e.* by sending the Apostles to persuade 'em to be so reconcil'd) when you should have prov'd that God was reconciling *himself to the world*, and this by paying himself the full price of their pardon. Then you bring for a parallel, an instance of a *creditor who pays himself, by helping his debtor to stock, and credit, and preferment, &c. that he may be able to make satisfaction for his debt.* But because any one will see that the debtor pays the debt out of his own improvements, not out of the creditor's own purse, therefore you recant your own words; and having before suggested that the *creditor paid himself*, you add, *That because 'twas paid by the debtor, 'tis not strictly call'd satisfying himself.* But why then did you bring it for an instance of that kind? It is a strange way of illustrating a point, by bringing an instance for it, and then giving a good reason why it won't answer.

The like may be said of *David's giving to God.* It was *David's* act, to give what was in his own power and choice to have withheld. God did not give to himself, to make himself amends for any wrong *David* did him; which is your case in hand, and seems very absurd. Wherefore,

2. In

have of divine justice, and, lay aside the evidence of Scripture, is so far from being true, that it is ridiculous. See his Sermons, p. 39, 40. which is such another solution as that of Dr. South's with regard to Christ's descent from Heaven, *Were it not to be adored for a mystery, it would be exploded for a contradiction.* South's Sermons, Vol. III. p. 316.

2. In the next place, you would not have it thought that God satisfies himself. Therefore,

(1.) You say, *Man paid his debt to God, enabled P. 3. to it by God.* What! does God enable *finite* man to do an *infinite* thing? To pay infinite satisfaction? It seems then that a mortal man, with God's help, can make sufficient satisfaction for sin. I thought that whatever is infinite is in none but God alone; and consequently, that if any infinite price be paid to God, 'tis paid by himself, to himself, and not by *man*, as you say. No not by the *human nature* of Christ, if that be your meaning; for *infinite* cannot come from *finite*, and *that nature* is no more. If you say, the infinite value comes from the *divine nature* united to it; then I say, his divine nature is satisfy'd by *value* receiv'd from itself, and so we are again where we were at first; and he still pays himself, which is a sort of payment we don't oft hear of, especially where severe *strict justice* has to do. And yet it is somewhat more harsh in case of *punishment*, to take strict satisfaction for one abuse, by suffering *another* from the same hand. If this be tremendous full satisfaction, then I don't see but our blessed Saviour, in bidding us, when smitten, to turn the other cheek, might intend not so much to teach us a lesson of patience, as to put us upon seeking rigorous satisfaction by a second blow. Thus I see you also can learn the *sophistry of not distinguishing between debts and punishments*. But this being too absurd, you add, as your last refuge,

(2.) That 'twas God the Son paid the satisfaction to his Father, one person to another; and so, say you, *the objection is wholly over*. I perceive 'tis troublesome to you, and therefore you are in haste to have it over. But 'tis not over yet:

P. 47.

This may account for satisfaction to the Father, but still here is no satisfaction to God the *Son*, unless he has satisfy'd himself. The question is, Did Jesus Christ satisfy the Father *only*; (else the difficulty remains still how he could satisfy himself) then who satisfies the Son? Can the Son be God, and yet not have divine justice essential to God? Or can *his divine justice* admit men to favour without a satisfaction? Will it not then follow that vindictive justice is not necessary to *God's nature*, but that he can forgive without a satisfaction, since God the Son does forgive without any, tho he have that *same* nature? Why then can't God the Father forgive the same way? But if on the other hand Christ be that very God, who can *no more remit the least farthing than cease to be*; and withal, it be absurd for one to give *penal* satisfaction to himself; which makes you say, *A Trinity is necessary to Christ's satisfaction*, (for else the Father alone might satisfy himself) then it follows we have *God the Son* to satisfy still, and so you have mended the matter well. Are not we in as bad a case as ever? For the *Son* has, according to you, as severe vindictive justice as the Father.

And is not that a defective expedient for our redemption, that leaves us without hope, unless we find another *infinite sacrifice* for the Son? Truly, Sir, I had much rather humbly trust in the rich mercy of a gracious God, thro' the mediation and intercession of the Lord *Jesus*, with a sincere repentance and obedience, without pretending to plead equivalent merit and full worth given him, for all the favour or good I want from him; than to offer a full satisfaction to but *one* divine person, and nothing at all to the other *two*, who, according to you, are as able to destroy me as *that other*, and having the same justice must needs

on the Satisfaction of Jesus Christ.

87

needs be as inexorable as *he*, without a satisfaction had been made to them also.

But to tell you the truth, I verily believe after all, that you and others of the same opinion do not think Jesus Christ has the *same* vindictive justice which you attribute to his *Father*. You say he is God *equal* to the Father, but you represent him by your scheme as much *more* gracious. And this I fear is the fatal tendency of your notions, to derogate from the glorious love and *free grace* of the Father of mercies, and to exalt Jesus Christ above him, in the vulgar esteem at least. The Father you call *power*, and represent p. 5. him inexorable, without full satisfaction to a *farthing*; but Jesus Christ *so good* and compassionate beyond him, that tho he be as much injur'd as his *Father*, and have as much right to demand satisfaction, yet he will remit all his debt without any compensation; a poor penitent shall be welcome to his favour, without any price paid him; nay, *so good*, that he will himself be at the expence to satisfy all the Father's demands too at full price. How can poor people forbear, by this rule, to think and speak more kindly of Jesus Christ, than of God? Is this one reason that makes so many bow at the *name of Jesus*, who yet stand stiff at the name of *his God and ours*? Or that teaches others to call a sermon of loving *Christ*, &c. *spiritual* preaching, while one of loving and obeying *God*, is relish'd as *dry* morality?

I find men are more willing to trust Christ than the *Father*: so that if Christ have not made an infinite satisfaction to the Father, but they be directed to hope in the Father's free mercy thro' Christ's intercession, they cry out they *are undone* and lost. Why so? Can't we trust the Father of mercies? May not we as well hope for the *Fa-*

Mat. 19.
17.

ther's favour without an equivalent, as for the Son's without any given to him? We must be beholden to some one for free *unmerited* favour; and why must the Father be dishonour'd with our despondent jealousy more than the Son? Cannot he, if he pleases, as well be at so much expence of goodness to give, as Christ be at the expence to purchase favour? Is not he as rich in goodness as the Son, who receives all from him? Would men be more undone, if left to *his* pity, of whom our Lord said, there is *none good but one, that is God*; than when left to *his*, who said, *Why callest thou me good?* for you must be left to the mere pity of either God or Christ, unless you can produce a full satisfaction made to both of them, which your scheme of infinite satisfaction will not allow.

I think 'twere better to desist from such arguments for *Christ's Deity*, till you are able to defend them, and till you can so manage them, as not to have them turn'd against yourself with so much force. But there is no ruling a rash indiscreet zeal! How many Teachers tell their people, that Christ could not be a sufficient Saviour as Mediator, except he were God Almighty *, who never consider the *abovesaid* consequences of making God a Mediator? And how many poor creatures have I heard speaking scornfully of Christ for a Mediator or Saviour, to whom Christ crucify'd seems to be a stumbling-block, if he could not make *infinite satisfaction* by suffering, who yet could not answer one of the arguments against such

* See how prophanelly Dr. Calamy talks, Sermons on the Trinity, p. 330. 345. 360. how scornfully he derides our Lord Jesus upon the supposition of his being God subordinate to the Father. calling him an *Arian Saviour*, such as is not worth while to contend for, trust in, serve and worship, even tho he had all the glory conferred upon him, that he possibly could bear or be capable of.

such satisfaction? as if the office and love of the Redeemer were contemptible, unless they be enabled to *claim* pardon and salvation from God, as things he is sufficiently *paid for*; or as if it were nothing worth to them, that the blessed Jesus has so lived and died for them, as to obtain the highest acceptance with God, and the highest power at his right hand, and then uses this interest for them. I perceive they, who so think, would never believe that Jesus Christ *is able to save them* Heb. 7. 25. *to the utmost*, for the Apostle's reason, viz. *Because he ever makes intercession for them.*

S E C T. VII.

The Socinians grossly misrepresented by Mr. Leslie. The Trinitarians sadly divided in their notions. The injustice of denying toleration to the Unitarians.

AS for your wild *Antinomian* suggestions, scatter'd up and down, about Christ's suretyship, his being the *reconciler of Angels*, who never offended, *as well as of men*; your pretty metaphors about being cloth'd in the *garments of our elder brother*, a bold word to use of Almighty God; for as Christ was *man*, you'll not say but there are elder brethren than he; your talk of *darning and cobbling, rubbing and scrubbing, patching and scouring the filthy rags of our best righteousness*, which the poor *Dissenters* have been jeer'd out of, by them of the *Church*, as *nauseous cant*; your asserting *all our best performances to be pro-* P. 45. *vocations*: these and many more such I can pass over, and impute them to a weakness, which might consist with an *honest* mind. But I cannot be so favourable to *other* instances, which bear the marks of *design'd dishonesty*, when you insi- P. 28. *nuate*

nuate that the *Socinians* deny hell-torments, and use such a way to prove it.

The *Racovian Catechism* and other writings expressly own *eternal punishments*; and Dr. *Stillingfleet* cites them, as asserting, that *God's veracity is concern'd in the execution of those threatnings on the impenitent*. But you make your *Socinian* deny this, and charge him with believing no *hell at all*; and to make out your reproach, you most unrighteously have put the very words of one of your *Trinitarians* upon the *Socinian*. So that should such men as you (and Mr. *Edwards*) hereafter happen to be credited, such things will pass for *Socinian* sayings, which either *none* of them did say, or at most did *no more* say than the *Trinitarians* themselves. Almost whole pages of Dr. *Tillotson's* sermon on *hell-torments* you have clapt sily upon your *Socinian*, as if 'twas originally from a *Socinian*; and *he*, in distinction from others must be charg'd therewith. I know not but some, both of one party and the other, may indeed approve that *sermon*, and yet not at all deny *hell-torments*, which is your inference only. But is the *Socinian* therefore to be upbraided by a *Trinitarian* with what words were originally the *Trinitarian's* own; and with a doctrine that they have so publicly contradicted, as well as their adversaries?

P. 29. Thus again, you make your abus'd *Socinian* to say, *He can't think it lawful to preach the Gospel against the command of the civil government, without such a commission as the Apostles had*; when they are the words of a *Trinitarian*, at the head of a *Trinitarian* church. And tho I will not justify *their* practice, who after they have settled their judgments in that persuasion of the *divine* unity, and have a fair opportunity given them, do yet want the zeal and courage of a Christian, to
confess

on the Satisfaction of Jesus Christ.

91

confess with their mouths what they believe in their hearts, nay, dare practise contrary to their faith; who, in matters of moment, and in which the honour of Christianity is so highly concern'd, are for having *their faith to themselves*, in a sense the *Apostle* (tho speaking of minute points only) *Rom. 14.* never seems to have intended; which only means, we should not uncharitably urge our opinions and little practices on others, nor that we should not own, or practise, nor impart our faith to the world: yet I may truly say this is no *Socinian* principle, witness the severe sufferings they have oft endur'd under *Trinitarians*, and sometimes at the stake, which with great constancy they have embrac'd, long since the *Reformation*. But how do you prove this to be a *Socinian* tenet? Is it any other way than this, *viz.* because you find a *Trinitarian* professing it? and not liking it in him, you unrighteously father it on the *Socinian*, tho none *such* appears ever to have been of that mind.

These are your *pious frauds*: because you could not raise *odium* enough from their own writings, you pick up any odious thing even out of the writings of their very opposers, and then make your *Socinian* to speak it, and this without naming the author from whom you took the passage; (*Tillotson's sermon on Josh. 24. 15.*) that it might look as if it were taken out of some *Unitarian* tract, which you pretend to be confuting. You might with some honesty, and from the same authority, have told the world, that the *Socinians* own *three persons in one God*, and the supreme Deity of a *derived Son*. This, Sir, may pass for your *method with the Socinians*.

Whether you intended to slur that illustrious Archbishop (whose noble parts, great integrity, and sweet temper, render'd him one of the
brightest

P. 45.

brightest ornaments of the church and age) by telling the world he was a *Socinian*, tho himself wrote against them; or intended rather to load the *Socinians* with other faults, it matters not: for either way it is such an unrighteous deliberate *slander* of your neighbour, such *false witness* borne against him, that I hope for your own sake you will not rely on Christ's satisfaction for your pardon without repentance. I find indeed you profess not to *stand or fall by your sincerity at the great day*. But whatever this error may be in speculation, I beseech you let's have no more *practical* instances of renouncing *sincerity*, because the world generally has some kindness left still for that virtue. I think this is enough to sink the credit of any reproachful stories, which you don't vouch by others.

This would lead me to reply, in the next place, to your angry reproaches and censures of the *Unitarians*; which I might attempt, by inquiring whether to be like the *Mahometans* or *Jews*, in their belief of the *unity of God*; or like to *Pagans*, in their multiplicity of *divine persons*, be most criminal? Whether you do well in representing the *Socinian*, as being at a greater distance from the rest of the Christian Church, than the *Mahometans*? While these deny the *Apostles creed* in the very letter, deny that Christ is the *Son of God*, on which the *Socinians* build their strongest arguments; deny that ever Christ *was crucify'd, dead or bury'd*, and that ever he *rose from the dead*; who supersede his *laws* (in subjection to which the very essence of a *Christian* lies, more than in right systems of faith) and receive another *rule*, another *Lord*, another and a carnal *hope*; whereas the *Unitarians* agree with other Christians in all these and many other great points.

As

As to your rarity of the address to the *Morocco* Ambassador, I see not what it amounts to, more than a complaint of the corruption of the Christian faith in the article of one God, which the *Mahometans* have kept, by consent of all sides. Yet forasmuch as I can learn nothing from any *Unitarians* of any such address from them, nor do you produce any subscribers names, I conclude no such address was ever made by any *deputed* from them, whatever any single person might do. I suppose you conclude from the matter of it, that it must be from some *Unitarian*, and perhaps so; yet you may remember, that so you concluded from the matter of Dr. *Tillotson's* sermons, that they were a *Socinian's*. Again,

Can you justify your rashness in saying, that *Unitarians* are not *Christians*? when to be a Christian, is to own the authority and receive the doctrine of Christ according to their best judgment, which one would think a charity, as little as yours, might readily grant they do, who in their belief go against all temporal motives, and bear the heavy wrath of their persecutors. Do they not worship the God of *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*? the same God that the Apostles worship'd, *who bow'd their knees to* Eph 3.14. *the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. Nay, don't they worship the *same* God that our Lord *Christ* himself, our great pattern, worship'd? And are they not *Christians* in their worship, who worship as *Christ himself* did? I pray who are Christians, if not these? Did he not say; *my God* and John 20. *yours*? q. d. You must have and own the same 17. God with me; or, you and I have the *same object of our faith and joy*. Do you pretend to shew, that ever Jesus Christ worship'd a *Son*, or *Holy Ghost*; shew it, and they will imitate him. In the mean time, if having just the same God and
object

object of supreme worship, as the man *Christ Jesus* had, must make them *not Christians*, they envy not any who claim the name of the *only Christians* upon the contrary ground.

Again, Where have the *Unitarians* ever said, *Paganism is preferable to the Christian doctrine*, as you assert in your *preface*? 'Twill concern you to shew, that you make some conscience of what you write, by making that heavy charge good; if you cannot do it, I shall henceforth have no great opinion of such *monopolizers* of Christianity. I know they may have said, that the doctrine of the *Trinity of real persons*, or minds in the God-head, is like the *Pagan plurality* of Gods; and I think you have shown something like it, in producing the testimony of *Heathens* to a Trinity. But as this is not *paganism* in general, only in one article; neither is this *preferring* paganism to Christianity in this very one point; nor is it to *Christianity*, but to what they deem corrupt impositions, that they liken Paganism in this point; and yet they count such Trinitarians to be Christians, because they have the *same rule* of Christ's word with themselves; and tho' they judge them very much mistaken in these points, yet they think they may hold inconsistencies, and hope the right part of the inconsistency prevails in their practice and worship of one *eternal He*, &c. if they act but sincerely, according to the best of their understandings, and really believe what they profess.

And I must tell you, that the so grievous charge of *Paganism* and *Tritheism* upon *Trinitarians* is own'd and made good by other hands than the *Socinians*. Some *Trinitarians* themselves have ingenuously own'd, that 'tis *Paganism* which some dignitaries of the church have maintain'd under their doctrine of a *Trinity of persons*, (Charge

of

of *Tritbeism* against Dr. *Sherlock*) and yet there are not a few of that same opinion, tho neither *Dis-senters*, nor the Church ever *spew'd out* any for this *Pagan Tritbeism*; but the former have courted See Vol. I. the men of *three infinite minds*, at the same time P. 23. that they were violent against an *Unitarian*. So that *Pagan Tritbeism* is not so strange a thing among them, who live and thrive either upon the *indulgence*, or the *establishment*, even in the judgment of more wary *Trinitarians* themselves. And tho Dr. *Sherlock* thought they made *nonsense* of their creed, who did not hold *the three infinite minds*; so that either they must be as much *Pagans* as he, or not *Trinitarians*; yet I shall not now examine that, only desire that *Socinians* alone may not be blam'd for charging the Trinity of some with *Paganism*, and that it may not be taken worse at their hands than at others.

This will lead me naturally to inquire next, what force there is in your reproach of the *Unitarians* with their differences among themselves, and what reason you have to boast of the sweet harmony of the *Trinitarians*. I know not one sect of Christians who have not some differences among themselves. The *Unitarians* are some of them more inclin'd to *Arianism*, and some to *Socinianism*, in their judgment concerning *Jesus Christ*; yet that hinders not their making the same account of his present dignity, whatever beginning they attribute to him. All of them agree as unanimously in the *negative*, what he is not, as *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* agree against *Popery*: and tho they have spoken, I think confusedly, about Christ's *divine worship*; yet I am satisfy'd, *Socius* himself, who was zealous for it, did not mean, that *supreme worship* was to be paid to Christ as a distinct person from the Father in him. See *Vindication of the worship* Vol. I. of Christ on Unitarian principles. But are not the Tract 3.

Trinitarians in a much worse case here? for surely a more notorious untruth never dropt from your pen, than what you conclude with, That *there are no doctrines, in which all Christian churches are so much united, as in the Trinity, incarnation and satisfaction of Christ.* I am astonish'd at such confidence! Are not all Christians as much agreed in the doctrine of Christ's *crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension*, in the doctrine of his coming to *judge the world*, and that of *eternal life*, as they are in the *Trinity and incarnation*? From the time men pretended to settle their creeds in *these points*; I say, from *thenceforth* they had nothing but *wars*, and to this day the *East* remain divided from the *West* on the point of the personal union. And the *Nestorians* (who are granted to be of the same mind with the *Socinians* or *Photinians*, by many *Trinitarians*; see the *Examination of the Bishop of Sarum's exposition of the 2d article*) are said to be more numerous than all the protestant churches. The *Greek* remains divided from the *Western* church upon the point of the *third person's* proceeding from *Father and Son*: and they are anathematiz'd in the *Albanasian* creed, in as much as they deny the Holy Spirit to proceed from the Son at all, by any *eternal procession*. See *Smith's state of the Greek church*; and *Seller's remarks on Athanasius*.

Among them of our *two British establish'd churches*, how many sorts of Trinities have been observ'd? Let's see in one of them what sweet harmony there is between Dr. *South's*, and Dr. *Sherlock's* Trinity. There are numerous followers of both schemes, and they own one another for *Christians*, so far forth, as little as any foreign *Socinians* will own some *English Unitarians*. Is this your agreement, which you adore *God's providence* for, when there is no agreement, whether

it be *one God*, or three? or whether the three persons be *three infinite minds* (i. e. Gods) or *three modes*? Each side has own'd the *Unitarians* to be more in the right than the other: One side says the three *modes* is *nonsense as well as heresy*; the other side accounts them *Pagan Tritheists*: see *Preface to Life of Valent. Gentilis*. So that if one go to one church, he'll join with a *nonsensical heretic*, says one; if to another, he joins with a *Pagan Tri-theist*, says the other. 'Tis not words and *terms*, but sense and conception that is a man's faith: so that unless there be the same meaning, as well as the same terms, there is not the same faith, tho they all profess a *Trinity* of words. Different explications make so many different *creeds*; and if the *Trinity* be reveal'd in Scripture so plainly, then I pray tell us which *Trinity* is so: for 'tis so plain, it seems, that one party says 'tis not the *Tritheists Trinity* of three minds; and the other says, 'tis not their *Trinity* of three modes, that the Scripture reveals: and the *Unitarians* are so complaisant as to take both their words; and yet each side is angry that they will not come over to their party. If it be a *fundamental* point, then one party *errs fundamentally*, since they are so contrary to each other in their *sense*, which you own is *the faith*: so that there is no escaping heresy at this rate. First, try to convert your *brethren in terms*, and then the *Unitarians* will not be distracted in their choice what side to take. And in such a woful distracted case (where no public decision could be gain'd, tho some have cry'd out for help till almost *hoarse*) were you over-wise to set up such a vain boast of your unity about the *Trinity*? If this be the article in which Christians great unity is to be boasted of, and the world call'd to *behold and see*

their blessed harmony herein, you did ill to tell it : but I know 'tis otherwise.

Let. Past.
Vol. III.

Then comes the *catholic church in all ages* for your opinion : This carries a brave sound with it, and all sides adorn their discourses with this flourish. It serves *Papists* and *Protestants*, *Greeks* and *Latins*, *Dr. South* and *Dr. Sherlock*, and none more justly than the deniers of the *Son's eternal personality*, and his *equality to the Father*, if you'll credit even their violent adversary *Mr. Jurieu*, (as far as concerns the most *primitive church-writers*, or *Ante-Nicenes*) who fully demonstrates, that they expressly deny'd those two great points, till *after-ages* mended their faith. This great and common boast of the *catholic church*, tempts one to put the question, once ask'd our Saviour, concerning the woman that had seven husbands, *Whose shall she be, for they all had her ?* The *catholic church in all ages* never agreed in any thing, if this be the chief instance of their agreement : I am sure they never agreed since these controversies begun, tho violence and art have not been wanting to make 'em unite. But here is the craft on't; men mean that those of their *own opinion only* are *catholics*, and then all *catholics* be sure are of *their opinion* : they have as narrow a notion of *catholic church* as the *Papists* have. All the great *Arian* councils, and *Arian* writers, and numerous *Nestorian* churches, and the age when the whole Christian world was *Arian*, &c. must be thrown by as none of the *catholic church*; and then be sure the *catholic church* (*viz.* of the *Athanasians*) is against the *Unitarians* : as tho any party cannot make the like sport with their *catholic church* ; for I find it is a very uncertain thing, and that every side has their *several catholic church*, when it comes to be examined. And how can it be otherwise ? since I have seen with my own eyes

(faith

(saith the admirable *Chillingworth*) councils against councils, some Fathers against others, nay against themselves, the Church and consent of one age against the Church of another. Just as if the votaries of episcopacy and presbytery should boast, the one, that the church of Great Britain is episcopal, the other, that it is presbyterian; when the truth is, it is partly one, partly t'other; one of the two semi-national Churches being of one sort, the other of the other sort. I am enough catholic if I agree but with Christ and his Apostles; they were orthodox, but warn'd us of a general apostacy, and Antichristian degeneracy coming in apace, and like to last long. Which side are of that apostacy, and which are Catholics, is to be try'd by the Scripture, rationally and consistently to be understood. Heresies must be, and it is not meant, that it should be only among the fewest or undermost, as the people are made to believe.

In short, a man may venture to talk big of the catholic universal Church's consent, but then it should be only in the pulpit, (which is the safest place I know of to speak in, where none may contradict him;) but you are too bold to venture it from the press at this time a-day, when the state of the Christian world is too well understood for men to be cheated with pretences to the catholic Church of all ages on any one side.

You insinuate, that the Unitarians should not be tolerated, and cry out, Yet there is no prosecution; when at the same time you know of an instance of severity towards him, whom you pretend to be their preacher, tho with many false circumstances. You say, he was spew'd out even by the Presbyterians; as if he were the worse Unitarian for what he has suffer'd for his principle,

viz. for denying that God Almighty had ever a Father, or was any one's Son; or as if it was such a wonder to be spew'd out by the *Presbyterians*. Don't you think they have as weak a stomach as others, and that they have as *spewing* principles in their catechism, of tolerating no false religion? Would you like your *jure-divino episcopacy* ever the worse, if any had been so unmannerly as to tell you, that it had been spew'd out, even by the *Presbyterians*, in a country you have heard of?

You say the *Arian persecutions* witness, that the *Unitarians* would persecute, when in their power. I see you can prove the *Unitarians* are no *upstart sect* when you please, since you charge them with crimes done 1300 years ago. I own the *Arians* were guilty of unchristian practices of this kind, even tho history should be thought to have aggravated matters. But must none be tolerated, whose opinions have been receiv'd by some persecutors? What will you then say for your party? Besides, who was it taught the *Arians* to persecute? Whatever *Athanasius* pretends, it is certain, the first severity used by *Christians* against one another was in the banishing *Arius* and his followers, says Bp. Burnet in his preface to *Lactan. Lives of persecut.* 'Twas by an edict made capital, so much as to keep an *Arian* book; than which I know not of a more cruel edict by *Lewis XIV.* I know no *Unitarian* however but abhors that unchristian retaliation; for I truly think no better of a *Christian persecutor* than I do of a *christian thief*, or *christian murderer*.

It is the inviolable unalienable right of a reasonable Being to worship and profess, according to his conscience, so long as nothing is done to the injury of the commonwealth in its proper concerns. Have not the *Unitarians* a God and

a conscience, and an awful eternity to be concern'd for? Would you have them abandon all public worship of God, or join in what they judge corrupt? Shall they thrust in upon those, who reject 'em (like you) as no *Christians*, and solemnly pronounce them *everlastingly damn'd*? Must they be thrust out of the churches, and yet not admitted to assemble themselves? Or shall they be provoked, and arraigned of monstrous *heresies*, and yet not have liberty to defend themselves? Is any thing more mean and pitiful than for a man to write against them with that licentious strain that you have done, and then to exclaim against suffering their books to appear in their own defence, as if you were conscious of your very great need of such a refuge?

I am sorry the nakedness of Christians should be thus expos'd: but as it is not possible to be hid, so if one side will run down the other, and allow them no quarter, but defame, and persecute, and damn, it must be expected they will retort arguments in their own defence. I wish indeed more healing methods were taken, than by enlarging *creeds*, and contracting *charity*; but I shall never expect good from any who have not an high esteem for those two cardinal virtues, *sincerity* and *moderation*.

Luke 6. 22. *Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake. Rejoice in that day, for behold your reward is great in heaven, for in like manner did their Fathers unto the Prophets.*



Having found among the Author's papers a Letter from him to a friend, wherein his judgment in relation to the point of redemption by Christ's death is very clearly and fully exprest; it was thought not improper to subjoin it here.

S I R,

I Receiv'd yours. As to your question, upon what account our redemption and pardon are ascribed to Christ's death? and how this may be said to be the price of them? I think you may gather my sense of the matter from the Tract concerning the satisfaction. But however, to express it as clearly as I can, I add, That the terms price and purchase, and the like, are but metaphorical to signify that Christ's death and blood were the costly means used in order to our obtaining pardon of God, without any strictly meritorious purchasing it from God by an exact equivalent price. But yet we are saved and ransomed and pardoned by his blood, as that was the highest instance of consummate obedience even to the death of the cross. Phil. 2. 8. with which the holy God was so pleased, that he exalted him to his right hand, and constituted him the only advocate, thro' whose mediation he would grant pardon and other favours to repenting sinners. His pardon is free in respect of any strict merit; therefore 'tis for his own sake, Isa. 43. 25. but in respect of the mediation interposed, 'tis for Christ's sake also. So that pardon is immediately obtained by Christ's

intercession, which is, on that account, preferred to his dying, *Rom. 8. 34.* But then his intercession owes its prevalence to his obedience and death; 'tis for the sake of this that God loves his Son and hears him always, and has given him standing power to grant remission of sins, *Acts 5. 31.* So that 'tis his obedience (so full of excellency, worth, and merit in some sense) which is the ground of all we gain by his intercession. And herein it appears, that the righteous Lord loves righteousness, by putting such a mark of honour upon the most holy and faithful Jesus, above all his brethren, as that their salvation shall be by his transaction; God will be merciful to men, but they shall stand at some distance for their impurities; he only, in whom was no sin, shall be held worthy of immediate approaches, under whom the rest, who become meet by repentance, shall seek relief. In short, 'tis *his intercession* that obtains our pardon, and it is *his obedience*, his piety and virtue (shewed in his death especially) that has recommended him to God as a beloved acceptable advocate. But they are more bold than wise, who dare say, men must have perish'd if Christ had not died, as if they were sure God could not have taken any other way to shew mercy. The Scripture says not so, nor any but very rash men. As to Dr. Outram's *vicariam pœnam*, and *nostro loco*, it is certainly true, that he who dies, any way, for this end to save another from dying, does die in his stead *. Christ did this, he died and endured with this design, that we might be brought to repentance, and be saved

G 4

from

* He who dies with an intention to do that benefit to another, as to save him from death, doth certainly to all intents and purposes die in his place and stead. Tillot. Sermon 47. p. 580. fol. edit.

from wrath to come, tho not from temporal death. The words *sacrificium* and *victim*a are applicable to any service offered to God, *Rom.* 12. 1. especially where life itself is expended in the service. But then say you, Why does St. Paul imply, that it might not be said of any other Saint, that he was crucified for us? *1 Cor.* 1. 13. I answer, That none could, none by suffering be our propitiation as Christ was, because none but he was a *lamb without spot*; none but he was fitted to obtain the honour of being exalted to God's right hand, as mediator; all besides were sinners, had the scars of sin on them, and deserved death for their own faults; his death was pure obedience, and he alone was appointed, as most worthy and excellent, to be partaker of that honour and office. Him *had the Father sealed*, and *worthy is the lamb that was slain*, &c. and in him it pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell, *Col.* 1. 19. And yet I observe, that tho St. Paul denies he was *crucified* for the *Corinthians* (that is, as Christ was, or for the same ends) yet he says, he did *suffer* for the church, *Col.* 1. 24. 'Tis the same word (*ὑπερ*, or *for you*) in both texts.

I no where find in the Scripture, that God intended to shew his hatred to sin or sinners, or his severity and vengeance, by Christ's dying; but only his great love and mercy to us: and yet by consequence, we may infer his displeasure at sin, in that he will not pardon it but by the interposing of one, who by great trials and acceptable obedience to perfection has recommended himself to his special favour. I take it, that the common mistake is grounded on this, that men judge, it was the very pain and smart, and tormenting misery of death, that did it self oblige God, as by a cruel punishment, which the text

no where warrants, nor seems it to agree with divine goodness at all; no, it was the obedience and virtue exercised under it, when it beset him in his Father's business, which was so grateful to God, and for which he has this distinguishing honour, that all favours shall pass thro' him to the rest of his brethren; so that what he has done was not by bearing God's vengeance, but by meriting his love and approbation. Our reliance on Christ is a persuasion of his being an acceptable advocate with God, by reason of his holy obedience to death, and a confidence in him, that we shall obtain the benefits of his intercession, and power to save us, if we walk in upright obedience to his gospel.



A FULL
INQUIRY
INTO THE
Original Authority
OF

That TEXT, 1 JOHN v. 7. *There
are Three that bear record in Heaven, &c.*

Containing an account of Dr. Mill's evidences from antiquity for and against its being genuine. With an *Examination* of his judgment thereupon.

Humbly *address'd* to both Houses of Convocation.

With a Postscript in answer to the excuses offer'd to take off the force of this *Address*.

Jerem. xxiii. 28. *He that bath my word, let him speak my word faithfully: what is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord.*

A FULL
INQUIRY
INTO THE
Original Authority

OF

THE TEXT, & JOHN V. 7. There
are three that bear record in Heaven, &c.

Containing an account of Dr. Whit's evi-
dences from antiquity for and against its
being genuine. With an Examination of
his judgment thereupon.

Humblly address'd to both Houses of Parliament.

With a Postscript in answer to the excuses offer'd to
take off the force of this Address.

Printed by J. Sturges, at the Angel in St. Dunstons Church-yard, 1715.

C O N T E N T S.

The Introduction.

C H A P. I.

The evidence produced against the authority of this text.

- I. *That it is wanting in the ancient Greek manuscripts.*
- II. *That it is wanting in the ancient versions.*
- III. *That it is not cited by the primitive Fathers.*

C H A P. II.

The evidence offered in support of the text.

- I. *Not from any supposal, that the Arians had raised this text. Nor from the pretended preface of Jerom to the canonical Epistles.*
- II. *From Greek writers or manuscript copies, from versions, and from the Latin Fathers Tertullian and Cyprian.*

C H A P. III.

The insufficiency of the arguments brought in support of the text.

- I. *As to the pretended Greek manuscripts; the British copy, those of the Complutenian edition, and Robert Stephens's.*
- II. *As to the Latin writers, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Victor Vitenfis.*
- III. *As to the answers given to the objections against the text.*

C H A P. IV.

The address to both houses of convocation.

P O S T S C R I P T.

An answer to some excuses offer'd to take off the force of this address.

To the Most Reverend
WILLIAM
Lord ABp of Canterbury,
PRESIDENT;

And the Right Reverend the
BISHOPS of the same Pro-
vince, his Grace's Suffra-
gans ;

And to the Reverend the CLERGY
of the Lower House of Convocation
now assembled ;

This Inquiry is Humbly Presented and Sub-
mitted by

THE AUTHOR.



*An Inquiry into the original
Authority of that Text,
1 John cap. 5. ver. 7.*

The INTRODUCTION.

IT is possible the laborious inquiries of many learned *critics*, who, with great diligence and accuracy, have sifted and scann'd the *classic* authors, some of 'em of no great moment, may be esteem'd by others only as the ingenious diversions of a dextrous and sagacious mind: since, when they have presented their authors a-new with their emendations and corrections, in restoring their old, or giving them new beauties, it is oft of so little use or consequence to the world, that it is well if their painful studies escape the censure of being a laborious loss of time.

But when learned and judicious men do, with seriousness and humble reverence, apply their industry and sagacity to examine the far more important writings that are to guide us in the way of salvation; when they shall discover the interpolations and additions, the errors or defects, which *these*, as well as other writings, by oft transcribing, may in so long a tract of time

An Inquiry into the

time have been liable to; when, by diligent comparing antient manuscripts and versions, and the frequent citations of the *text* in the primitive Christian writers, they become able to inform us certainly what is *original* and genuine, and what not, in any part of the Bible, more especially where some matter of great moment is concern'd, their learned industry is then sure to be well employ'd, and will be recompens'd not only with the applauses of the curious, but the thanks, and which is more, the real edification and satisfaction of the serious inquirers after truth; who greatly desire to know what God would have 'em believe and do, to have the *chaff* separated from the *wheat*, and the *τό ἄδολον γάλα*, the *sincere* unadulterated *milk* of the word, for their spiritual growth.

The peculiar veneration due to the sacred writings requires us to keep that precious *depositum* as pure as possible, and free from all human spurious additions. Why then should the learned critics exhaust all their learning, reading, and discerning skill, upon the trifles of a witty or wanton *poet*, or a fabulous and remote *historian*, and wholly neglect to make as severe an inquiry into the holy Scriptures, in which are the words of eternal life, in order to discover what is the genuine text among the various readings of different copies, that we may build our faith upon it with the greatest certainty we can attain to?

Bp. Hare.

I know a late ingenious author of the *difficulties and discouragements, which attend the study of the Scriptures*, has pointed at the worldly discouragements, which, he judges, have tempted our cautious critics to turn their studies another way. I wish him success in his address to have these hindrances remov'd, that it may be

as

as safe, where it is more important, to do justice to the writings of the Apostles, as of any other Author.

The very learned and judicious Dr. Mill has done much for one man, in his celebrated labours on the New Testament; which, whatever may be wanting, will long stand as a lasting monument of his praise-worthy zeal and well-employed abilities. A specimen of what he has done upon one single *verse* I am now to produce: And if upon a full and impartial consideration it shall appear to your unbiased judgments, that there is abundant evidence of a spurious addition; may I not justly hope that the rulers and guides of the church, who can better judge of such evidences than the unlearned can, will yield their conscientious compliance, and not render such commendable inquiries fruitless by refusing to receive the truth, and to rectify our books, when the true reading is found? Else to what purpose do men inquire how it was *in the beginning*, if we resolve not to return to it? or to search after the right, if we will still adhere to what is wrong, and will rather maintain custom than truth?

This is what I shall have some right to insist upon, and for the sake of truth to press upon your Lordships and the Clergy; when I shall have made it appear, from his *Dissertation* on 1 John 5. 7. that the Doctor himself has overthrown the credit of *that* text by the evidence he has given that it is not original and genuine, tho he has not acknowledg'd himself overcome by it.

In order to manifest this, I shall,

1. In the *first* place (for the sake of others, who need more information) lay down the sum of that evidence, which the Doctor has produced

to shew that these words in the seventh verse, *There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit; and these three are one* or rather these words in the seventh verse, *In heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit: and these three are one: And* (ver. 8.) *there are three that bear witness in earth*, were not in the original text, but have been added in later times without just authority.

2. I shall put down what he had to offer on the other side for establishing the authority of these words, and upon which he has determin'd in favour of their being original and genuine.

3. I shall shew the weakness of those arguments by which he endeavours to support the authority of this text: that so it may be judg'd whether he had just reason to make such a determination, or we to abide by it.

CH A P. I.

The evidence produced against the authority of the text. 1. That it is wanting in all the antient Greek manuscripts. 2. That it is wanting in the antient versions. 3. That it is not cited by any of the primitive Fathers.

I shall lay down the evidences produced against the authority of *this text*, as not having been originally in St. John's epistle. Only let me first observe, that the text itself, and context, have no *internal* evidence, to persuade us that the words are genuine: for as these words themselves are not to be match'd with any in the whole Bible, so the context is complete without 'em, and rather more smooth and easy. The *three* following witnesses having been already distinctly spoken of,

It was very natural to sum 'em up in one conclusion; *There are three that bear witness, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood.* But the other three witnesses had not been mention'd, to give any occasion for the like to be said of them.

Nor was it likely the *Spirit* should be produc'd as another witness *on earth*, if it had been number'd before among the witnesses *in heaven*. The *Spirit* was no more an inhabitant of the earth, than the *Father* and *Word* were; who also operated and gave their testimony, not in heaven, but on earth. Nay, the *Word incarnate* was more properly an inhabitant of the earth than the *Spirit*, and yet is not reckoned among the witnesses on earth. Is it likely the *Spirit* should be made twice a witness in the matter, and so give two testimonies for one of the *Father* and *Word*?

But since the Doctor's inquiry was only after *external* evidence from authorities and testimonies, it shall be my present business to examine them.

And here it must be own'd, that Dr. *Mill* has done justice; so that very little more can be said in the case. It is a subject which had been long and often examin'd with niceness from the beginning of the reformation, and very much illustrated by the great sagacity of the late learned and laborious critic, Father *Simon*, in his *critical history of the New Testament*, chap. 18. Dr. *Mill's* business was not so much to search for evidences, as to collect, with no small pains, what had been offer'd; and to present it in one view, and in good order.

These evidences are taken, (1.) From antient Greek manuscript copies. (2.) The antient *Versions*. (3.) The writings of the antient Christian *Fathers*. And indeed whither should we go to

learn what was in the Apostles writings, but to the oldest copies of those writings, (which are lost or consum'd themselves) and the oldest versions made from them, and to the old Christian writers who have quoted and transcrib'd very much of them into their own books?

SECT. I.
Greek
Manu-
scripts.

Proleg.
p. 143,
144.

p. 108.

Crit. Hist.
v. 18.

Let us hear how many antient manuscript Greek copies are without this text. The Doctor tells us, in his *notes* on the words, *That 'tis certain all these words, in heaven, the Father, Word, and holy Spirit, and these Three are One; and there are Three that bear witness in earth*, are wanting in most copies. Then he enumerates them particularly, in his *dissertation upon this subject*; beginning with our famous *Alexandrian* copy, which he elsewhere calls *ingens thesaurus orientalis*, and *the most precious treasure the Christian world ever saw for these twelve hundred years, and by far the most antient copy in the world, which most exactly expresses the original*.

Next comes the famous *Vatican* copy, which he extols much after the same manner, as of very great credit, and above twelve hundred years old; by which, according to Pope *Leo's* order, the *Complutensian* edition was to be made. 'Tis enough to shake the credit of this text with all impartial men, that 'tis wanting in these *two*, the most valuable and antient copies we know of in the world. Yet besides this, the Doctor gives a long roll of the other very valuable manuscript Greek Copies, in the most famous libraries of the learned, and of our two universities, and of the *French* king, (where Father *Simon* made a diligent search, and says, he found not one that had *these* words, of all the seven which he view'd, nor of the five manuscripts of Mr. *Colbert*, tho some of these be of later date) also *two* at *Basil*,
one

one at Venice, and many more. All these want *this* Text, tho in some of the later Manuscripts there are in the margin short notes, by way of gloss or comment, over against *the spirit, the water, and the blood*; applying *these* to the Father, Word, and Spirit, according to an antient mystical interpretation, of which hereafter. And from the margin Father Simon judges *these words* did afterwards slide into the text, which are in our *seventh verse*. Which is a very natural and easy account, and the only way by which Dr. Mill himself accounts for so many other interpolations, in his notes and his *Prolegomena*.

And whereas Dr. Mill once thought Robert Stephens had found the words in eight manuscripts, (because out of fifteen copies which he had, he mentions but seven as wanting this verse; whence the Doctor slipped into the common mistake, and took it for granted that the other eight had it) he found upon examination that those eight copies of Stephens had not St. John's epistle in them; so that all, which had the epistle, wanted *this verse*. Proleg. p. 117.

To these of Dr. Mill, the learned Dr. Kuster adds one authority more from the *Codex Seidelianus*, brought out of Greece, and about 700 years old*. So that I think I may say, in one word, all the Greek manuscripts, which are found, do agree in rejecting the text under consideration.

He considers the antient versions of the New Testament. These were made for the use of such people, as in early times were converted to the Christian religion, but did not understand the Greek language, in which the New Testament

H 3

was

* In his edition of Dr. Mill's Test. Rotterdam 1710. which is what I make use of. T. E.

was written; for their benefit it was translated into their own language. The most antient of these versions were the *Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopic, Arabic, Latin*; all which, with the *Russian*, have not the text: so that when these versions were made, there was no such passage in the *Greek* copies or original, from whence they were made. Of the *Latin* version the Doctor says *, *'Tis certain this verse was wanting in all the most antient Latin copies, except some in Africa, in Tertullian's and Cyprian's time, &c.* Which exception is a mere supposition grounded on his mistake (as I shall shew) that *Tertullian*, and especially *Cyprian*, had cited these words in their books.

P. 141.

P. 152.

P. 128.

Bp. Burnet's Letters Let I. towards the end.

The antient *Italic* version, he says, was made near to the *Apostles* time, from the best copies. Of the *Coptic*, that it was from one of the best and earliest. Of the *Syriac*, that the learned agree it was made in the very next age to the *Apostles*. He tells us moreover, that even the *Latin* manuscripts at *Bazil, Zurich, Strasburgh*, (800 or 900 years old) and two others, *Duo Donatiani*, want these words: That the words however are inserted in the bottom of the page in one by another hand; and in the margin of another by the same hand.

Crit. Hist. ib.

Father *Simon* observes, that in these later copies of *St. Jerom's* bible, where these marginal notes are found, the order of the words, and the *three witnesses* are various and diverse; which he takes to be a good proof that they were not in the first copies; who adds also one very old *French* version of a thousand years, which has not the words.

I need but mention the first editions of the New Testament, corrected by the manuscript copies

* Certum est hunc versiculum abfuisse à vetustissimis Codicibus Latinis omnibus, præter Africanos quosdam, &c. p. 140,

copies, about the beginning of the reformation; viz. by *Erasmus*, *Aldus*, *Colinaus*, printed in divers places, which he owns had not *this* verse; nor the versions of *Luther*; because these are of no authority beyond the manuscript copies, by which they might be directed: which, it appears, did then want *this* verse, otherwise they durst not have left it out, in prejudice to a receiv'd opinion of the church, and in contradiction to the vulgar versions at that time.

He examines the writings (of the primitive SECT. III. Christians or *Fathers*: forasmuch as these very Primitive Fathers. frequently cite the sacred writings on all occasions, and had such frequent and great occasions to speak of the *Trinity*, and of the *Holy Spirit*; it may well be concluded, such a text, of singular importance, and so exceeding pertinent to their design, and where there is no other text to supply the want of it fully or directly in the whole New Testament, could not be forgotten by all of them, and at all times, if it had been known by them. And here,

1st, He makes inquiry among the *Greek Fathers*, to see if he can hear of *this* text among them, who were most likely to have seen the authentic originals of the Apostles, and needed not a version into another language. Of these he gives this melancholy account; *Neminem unum, &c. That not one Greek writer from the beginning of Christianity to St. Jerom's time* (about 400 years) *has ever cited this verse.* And adds, 'Tis certain it has been wanting in the *Greek copies* very near from the *Apostle's* writing *this* epistle. And therefore wonders at the author of the preface to the canonical epistles, in the *Latin* bibles, which passes under the name of *St. Jerom*, for saying this verse was in all the *Greek* copies:

whereas, says the Doctor*, not one of the *antients* had ever heard a word of it. For which, and other reasons, he justly concludes, as do other critics, that that preface is not St. *Jerom's*.

Not content with these *generals*, he runs over the particular most eminent *Greek Fathers*, and those who were most likely to have produced this text, if they had known of it, who yet never mention it.

1. Not *Ireneus*, l. 3. c. 18. who to prove the deity of Christ cites this *first epistle of John* (more than once) nay, he cites this *fifth chapter*, and yet says nothing of *this verse* which had been so apposite to his design.

2. Not *Clemens Alexandrinus*.

3. Not *Dionysius Alex.* or the *epistle*, under his name, to *Paul of Samosata*, almost wholly about the Trinity, and the Deity of Christ; in which the *eighth verse* is cited, and the three other witnesses, the *spirit*, the *water*, and the *blood*, but not the words in dispute.

4. Not *Athanasius* himself, who had his wits about him, and as much at work in these matters as any man; in whose *genuine* works (more to be regarded surely than the *spurious* books falsely attributed to him for the other side) even those in which he labours to prove the Trinity, and Deity of Christ and the Holy Spirit, by all the texts he could think proper, we find no mention of *this* great text, as he must have deemed it. So that the Doctor again confesses, he knows not of one *Greek Father* before the time of the *Nicene Council*, who ever cited it.

5. Not the Fathers of the council of *Sardica* in their synodical epistle; in which, for proof of a Trinity of persons in one essence, they alledge

Theodor.
l. 2. c. 8.

John

De quo nemo veterum quidquam inaudiverat.

John 10. 30. but not these words, *The Father, the Word, and the Spirit; and these three are one*; which had been much more fit to their purpose. They needed not twice have cited, *My Father and I are one*, which yet did not include the Spirit at all: the once urging this passage, *These Three are One*, would have been more for their purpose than a hundred repetitions of that other text.

Certainly all those Fathers, who came from so many several quarters out of *Asia, Africa, and Europe*, as the preamble of the epistle shews, could not be ignorant of this text which they so much wanted, if there had been any knowledge of it in any part of the Christian world.

6. Not *Epiphanius*, who among the many texts, alledged against the *Arians* and *Pneumatomachi* quite omits this.

7. Not *Basil*, in his book of the *Holy Ghost*, whom he had a mind to join with the *Father* and *Son* in the doxology, but was kept in awe by such as watched his words.

8. Not *Alexander*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, among the many texts for the unity of the *Father* and *Son*, in his epistle. *Theodor.* l. 1. c. 4.

9. Not *Nyssen*, in his thirteen books against *Eunomius*, of the Trinity, and deity of the *Holy Spirit*.

10. Not *Nazianzen*, in his oration against the *Arians*, or in his fifth oration *de Theologia*; where, to prove the Spirit to be God, he alledges the next words, but not these.

11. Not *Didymus*, in his book of the *Holy Spirit*.

12. Not *Chrysostom*, on the same subject.

13. Not *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, tho he cites the verses before and after to prove the deity of the Spirit; *Theauri Assert.* 34.

14. Not

1stly. Not the *Author of the exposition of the faith*, among *Justin Martyr's* works; who endeavours to prove the *Father, Son, and Spirit* to be of one essence from their being joined together in *Mat. 28. 19.* but not from this text, more directly for his purpose.

2dly. Not *Cassianus*.

3dly. Not *Proclus*, tho both of them upon a subject that gave occasion.

4thly. Not the *Nicene Fathers* themselves, according to *Gelasius*, for *Leontius* bishop of *Coppa-*
dona answering, in their name, the arguments of a certain philosopher who opposed the deity of the *Holy Spirit*, among other texts insisted on the words immediately preceding, viz. *It is the Spirit that witnesseth, because the Spirit is truth*; but omits this verse.

Here let me add what *Du Pin* observes, That as no *Greek Father*, for five hundred years, quoted this passage, so two of them, viz. *Didymus* of *Alexandria* in the fourth century, and *Oecumenius* in the eleventh, have written commentaries upon this epistle of *St. John*, and yet mention not this verse: which, says he, proves that either they did not know it, or not believe it to be genuine.*

Thus far then the way is clear thro the ancient *Greek* writers for so many hundred years; even to an age or two after *Athanasius*, as the Doctor confesses †.

2dly, For the *Latin Fathers* the Doctor grants, that neither the *Author of the treatise of the baptism of heretics*, among *Cyprian's* works, (tho he mentions

* *Hist. of the Canon, Vol. 2. p. 78.*

† *Quinque nullum omnino codicem Græcis ecclesiis in usu fuisse credo, nisi qui ad mutilatos, quos dicimus, descriptus sit, pene ab ipsius archetypi scriptura usque ad seculum unum vel alterum post Athanasium.*

mentions the *verses* both before and after) nor Novatian, nor Hilarius, nor Calaritanus, nor Phabadius, have ever cited these words: Nor Ambrose, who also has the *verses* on both sides; nor Jerom, nor Faustinus, nor Austin, who yet would have the *Father, Son, and Spirit*, to be mystically signify'd by the *Spirit, the Water,* and the *Blood*, in the *next verse*: Nor Eucherius, who has the same notes on the next verse; nor Leo Magnus; nor Facundus Hermianensis, who also cites the *eighth verse*: Nor Junilius, nor Cerealis, nor Bede, (in the eighth century) who, in his comment on this epistle expounds the *three other witnesses*, but not this *seventh verse*. Tho soon after his time, the Doctor says, the *Western bibles began to have it common*: which I shall not much dispute.

The reader must note, that all these ancient writers are here produced, not merely for not mentioning *these words* (for then a much greater number might have been brought) but because they treated professedly of such subjects as required the assistance of *this text*, and many of 'em of the *context*, and *next verses*. And therefore tho others might omit it, as not having occasion to alledge it, yet *all these* could never have omitted it on any other reason but this, That they had it not in their *bibles* (as the Doctor justly argues) for *above 700 years*.

Now methinks here is a pretty large stock of evidence, and as much as one can well require for a negative, to shew that *this verse* was not originally any part of the New Testament: and one had need have very direct and peremptory testimonies to the contrary, to make him so much as to hesitate in the matter. There must be great weight, to cause an *equilibrium*, and much greater to turn the scales, and make him determine

determine for what seems hitherto irrecoverably lost.

CHAP. II.

The evidence offered in support of the Text.

I. *Not from any supposal that the Arians had rased this text, nor from the pretended preface of St. Jerom to the canonical epistles.*

II. *From Greek writers or manuscript copies, from Versions and from the Latin Fathers, Tertullian and Cyprian.*

I Shall now consider what Dr. Mill has offered for superior evidence on the other side, to prove *this verse* genuine, against all that has been said.

And now he has a *hard task* indeed, to undo all that had hitherto been done, and to prove *this text* authentic, against all these manuscript *Greek copies*, all the *old versions*, all the before-mention'd *primitive writers*, both *Greeks* and *Latins*, down to the eighth century; who all that while knew nothing of it.

No doubt it would be a grateful service to the Church, of which he was a worthy member, if he could justify her putting it into her *Bible* as current Scripture, (tho that has been but of late) and could support the credit of a *text*, on which principally some important branches of her *creed* and *public offices* seem to be founded. Here is a great deal to excite one to try what can be said, by a kind friend, in the case; who was unwilling to leave the matter fairly stated on both sides, without giving it the weight of his own judgment on *one side*, which no doubt had otherwise

otherwise been thought to be for the *contrary*. 'Tis well known how many are apt to regard a learned author's own opinion, more than to examine his premises, or weigh his arguments. But what has he to say in *this* cause?

In the *first* place, I must shew what *arguments* SECT. I. he refuses to make use of: especially *two*, which have been often urged by others thro' mistake, or want of judgment, or popular prejudice. As,

1. That the *Arians* have *raised this text* out of the bible, because it thwarted their opinion. This passes for current among the people, and is taught 'em by their expositors, even by Dr. *Hammond*, and many other less judicious commentators. But the learned Dr. *Mill* rejects the suspicion of this with indignation and scorn: for * *how should the Arians*, says he, *put out the words, which were out already, 150 years before Arius was born?* And he says, that *Ambrose*, who, alone of the *antients*, objected this, in relation to another text, John 3. 6. (not the text in dispute) *was under a mistake*: as he shews in his notes on that place.

Nor will the Doctor suspect any of the *Gnostic* Heretics in former times; whom their opposers accused indeed of making *new* gospels, but not of corrupting the *old*: only *Marcion* was charg'd with interpolating the gospels and St. *Paul's* epistles, but not the *Catholic* epistles. Nor could they corrupt the copies in *other* Christians hands, nor yet those in their *own*, without being soon discovered. Thus the Doctor clears the heretics, as being without just cause suspected in this matter: *I don't think any heretic corrupted*

* Quid enim illis cum hac pericope, sublata è contextu Græco 150 annis antequam Arius naceretur?

corrupted the text in any part, much less in this famous testimony of St. John †.

2. He utterly rejects the authority of the preface to the canonical epistles, under the name of St. *Jerom*, in the first printed *Latin* bibles; which pretends that all the *Greek* copies had *this verse*, and that the *Latin* translators had done unfaithfully in omitting it. And tho even the *Latin* bibles, which had this preface, wanted this verse after the complaint made, (which shew'd that the preface and the version were not by the same author) yet this gave great trouble to *Erasmus* (and others) how to reconcile this to the plain evidences of the contrary: He was well assured the *verse* had not been in the *Greek* copies, and therefore charges *Jerom* with falshood and forgery. And the learned bishop *Fell* was at the needless pains of vindicating St. *Jerom*, and justifying his preface, in *his notes on Cyprian*; when after all, our learned Doctor, who acknowledges that himself once had a great regard for this preface, before he had examined into it, is fully convinced (with F. *Simon* and *Du Pin*) that 'tis not St. *Jerom*'s, nor is it found in the most antient manuscript copies of his version; nor with *his* name, in some other copies where it is, as F. *Simon* tells us: but is the work of some *silly rhapsodist* after *Bede*'s time, as the Doctor says, and then joined to the *bible*, which contradicted the preface.

Crit. Hist.
c. 18.
Ineptien-
tis Rhapsodist.

So that the learned will no more be troubled with this pretended authority of St. *Jerom*'s preface, nor get any aid from it towards the support of the credit of *this verse* we are inquiring after.

† Non puto quenquam hæreticorum S. textum in aliquo, nedum in hoc nobilissimo Johannis testimonio, depravasse.

I am next to consider what authorities the Doctor SECT. II.
 does insist on, on behalf of *this text*.

As for testimonies from the antient *Greek* writers, he had left himself very little to say from them, having confess'd there is *no* one of these, before the council of *Nice*, who takes any notice of *this text*. And therefore, tho' he puts down *Scriptures* *Greek* for one of his *topicks*, he is hard put to it to find any, and is content to mention only *one* oblique testimony, which he would have pass for *probable*, from a spurious work falsely ascrib'd to, but long after *Athanasius*†. And he is suspected to be a *Latin* Author too; who only says; *Idem quædam scriptis ad Eusebium* John says these three are one. Which *τὰ ἐν*, with the *article*, are neither exactly the words of the seventh nor eighth verse; and *E. Simon* judges they refer to the latter, which was usually apply'd to the *Father, Son, and Spirit* at that time; as *Dr. Mill* owns it was in *St. Austin's*. Hence he leaps at once down to the council of *Lateran* under *Innocent* the third, in the 13th century; and to *Calecas*, in the 14th, who was a *Greek*, and turn'd to the *Latins*. All which is to no purpose at all, but to increase the number of testimonies.

† Author
 disputati-
 onis in con-
 cil. Nicen.

The *Greek* manuscripts he pretends (which will be found only suppos'd) are, 1. A manuscript in *Britain* of which *Erasmus* speaks, and by which he was moved (against his own free judgment) to put *these words* into his last editions of the *New Testament*, against the evidence of all the other manuscript *Greek* copies. 2. Some manuscripts which the Doctor supposes *Robert Stephens* to mention, as having most of the words, all, except *ἐν τῷ ὁρατῷ*, in *heaven*. 3. The antient *Vatican* copies, which the editors of the *Complutensian Bible* say in general they were directed

rected by, and the Doctor hopes they were so in *this* particular, which they have taken into this edition.

In his reply to Mr. Nelson, p. 207. I think it will appear that all these are but suppositions of such copies as never were seen, nor produced by any others to this day. To all which, Dr. Clarke has given a learned and full answer, except to Stephens's manuscripts, where he seems to have mistaken the objection; of which hereafter.

As to the *Versions*, Dr. Mill had none very antient to bring. The *vulgar*, of which some manuscripts have it, and others want it, as is noted by the *Louvain* editors; the *Italic* printed at *Venice* in 1532. (while the old *Italic*, and St. *Jerom's* correction of it was otherwise) are not worth regarding in this matter: nor the

Printed at Venice, 1602. *Apostolos*, or collection of sections out of the *Apostles* books, with some remarks. Only, whereas the Doctor mentions the *Armenian* version for having this *verse*, as he was inform'd;

Append. Paradox. p. 376. the very learned *Sandius* testifies the contrary, having himself seen it with the *Armenian* Bishop at *Amsterdam*.

Lastly, the Doctor produces his *Latin* Fathers, which are indeed his main strength and confidence.

1. *Tertullian, contra Prax. c. 25.* his words are: *The Paraclete shall take of mine, says Christ, as he did of the Father's. Thus the connexion of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Paraclete, makes the three closely united with one another, which three are one, but not one person; as it is said, I and my Father are one**. Which the Doctor thinks, with Bishop *Bull* and Dr. *Hammond*, are an allusion to our text in dispute.

2. *Cyprian,*

* De meo sumet, inquit, sicut ipse de patris, ita connexus Patris in filio, & filii in paraceto, tres efficit coherentes, alterum ex altero, qui tres unum sunt, non unus; quomodo dictum est, Ego & Pater unum sumus

2. *Cyprian, De unitate ecclesie*, his words are: *It is written of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, These three are one* †; or *three are one*, as some copies have it: and, in his epistle *ad Jubaianum*, *Tres unum sunt, three are one*; without any reference to the Scripture express'd. And near 300 years after comes *Fulgentius*, a Bishop of *Africa*, and says that *Cyprian* in the former words had respect to *St. John's* testimony.

3. *Victor Vitenfis*, who tells us of a confession of faith, presented by *Eugenius* Bishop of *Carthage* and other Bishops to *Huneric* king of the *Vandals*; in which this text is cited as from *St. John*, in the manner we now have it, in the year 484.

4. *Vigilius Tapsensis*, *Fulgentius*, and the Author of the *Explication of the faith, ad Cyrillum*.

And thus you have the whole of what must over-balance all the evidence on the other side: which, whether it will do or not, is to be consider'd in the next chapter.

C H A P. III.

The insufficiency of the arguments brought in support of the text and in answer to the objections against it. 1. *As to the pretended Greek manuscripts; the British copy, those of the Complutensian edition, and Robert Stephens's.* 2. *As to the Latin writers Tertullian, Cyprian; and Victor Vitenfis.* 3. *As to the answers given to the objections against the text.*

I Shall here shew the insufficiency of these arguments brought to support the authority of
VOL. II. I this

† De Patre, Filio, & Spiritu Sancto scriptum est; Et hi tres unum sunt.

this *text*, against *those* produc'd to overthrow it.

I suppose no man of reason will desire me to give any answer to what the Doctor could lay no stress upon: I mean, such modern testimonies as *Calecas* and the council of *Lateran*, our late editions and *versions*, or the vulgar *Latin* Bibles since *Bede's* time. Therefore I shall say no more to them; nor indeed to *Vigilius Tapsensis* and *Victor Vitensis* nor to any writer so long after the heats between the *Arians* and *Atbanasians* *, and when the invasions of the barbarous nations had thrown all into confusion and ignorance. Such modern testimonies will only tell me, that *these words* did at last appear. All this I know well enough, for I see they are brought into the *Latin* versions, and since that into our *printed Greek* copies; and into our *English* translations, first in *little characters* for distinction, and next with as good a *face* as the rest of the *text*. And if this began to be done in the fifth, or sixth, or seventh century, what is that, any more than if it was in the fifteenth or sixteenth? But if the *words* were not in *St. John's* epistle for so many hundred years, nor known to the christian church as such, I shall conclude that no man can give a good reason for admitting 'em since.

And a thousand smooth suppositions (which are, in like cases, found to be false by daily experience) that such and such a writer would not, in later times, have used *the words*, or put them into the bible, if he had not good evidence they were in the original, are of no force against all the *Greek* manuscripts and Fathers, which plainly shew they certainly were not *there*. If
upon

* i. e. after the heats had continued so long, not after the heats were *over* as Mr. *Martin* understands it. See his examination of Mr. *Emlyn's* answer. p. 42.

upon the whole matter there cannot be found one *Greek* manuscript, nor one *Greek* writer, who mentions it for a thousand years; nor one *Latin* writer to the fifth century (if St. *Cyprian* be not the man, which shall be inquired into) what signifies all the rest? Men may be fond of a spurious issue, but that will not legitimate it.

There are then only *two* things of weight to be clear'd: *First*, The pretended *Greek* manuscripts; and, *Secondly*, The testimonies of the *Latin* writers, *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*.

The pretended *Greek* manuscripts are of three sorts. SECT. I.
The *Greek* manu-
scripts.

(1.) The *British* copy which *Erasmus* speaks of; who not finding one *Greek* copy which had this passage, would not put it into his two first editions of the New Testament; but upon information of a copy in *England* which had it, did, against the faith of all his copies, afterwards insert it*; rather, as he confesses, to avoid the reproach of others, than that he judg'd it to be of sufficient authority. For which F. *Simon* thus rebukes him: *With what warrant could he correct his edition by one single copy, which, as himself believ'd, had suffer'd some alteration?* The *British* copy.
Crit. Hist.
c. 18.

And it appears he had reason to suspect it: for who ever saw this *British* copy since, or any one that could produce it? Dr. *Mill* does not tell us where it was, or that ever he heard more of it. Such rare discoveries, so useful and grateful to the public, are not wont to be lost again in so critical an age. What! cannot all the learned men of our two universities, nor our numerous clergy, give us some account of it? Surely either there was no such copy, or it is not for the purpose:

I 2

else

* Ex hoc Codice Anglicano reposuimus, quod in nostris dicebatur deesse, ne sit causa calumniandi, tametsi suspicor Codicem illum ad nostros esse correctum.

else it had probably, long before this time, been produc'd. I am apt to think it did the best service it ever cou'd do, in the cause, in thus imposing upon the great *Erasmus*. Strange! that a *British* copy is only to be mention'd by one beyond the seas, while all *Britain*, and such an inquisitive *British* critic as Dr. Mill, can know nothing more of it. Foreigners will expect to hear of it from us, rather than we from them. F. Simon says *Erasmus* saw it; but where does *Erasmus* say so? He only says (in his *Annotations*) *There is found one Greek manuscript among the English, which hath it*†. He needed not then have said, *Suspicion*, &c. he cou'd, I think, have made a clearer judgment of it, if he had seen it. And if he was abused by *mistinformation* or otherwise, 'tis hard first to deceive him, and then to make his mistake an authority in the case.

The manuscripts of the Complutensian edition.

(2.) The Doctor depends on the manuscript copies, by which he supposes the *Complutensian* edition was regulated; because *these words* are there, and the editors say in general, they follow'd the best and most antient manuscripts of the *Vatican*.

But as they don't say, that they were directed by *those* manuscripts in putting in *this verse*, so it appears they were not; because, by the Doctor's own confession, the *most ancient and most correct copy of the Vatican*, which is so justly extol'd by him, (and comes at least very near to the famous *Alexandrian manuscript* in the royal library here) wants these words, which *those editors* have put in: And how then did they follow it so closely as is pretended? Nay, this excellent *manuscript* was that which Pope *Leo* recommended to them, as the ground-work and standard of their edition,

to

† Repertus est apud Anglos Græcus Codex unus, in quo habetur.

to which they were to keep, and to note the variations of other copies in their margin, and which for the most part they did; and yet in this they forsook it. And 'tis no wonder, if they did so by the rest of the *Vatican manuscripts*, as Proleg. p. 108. appears.

For *Cariophilus* afterwards, having by order of Pope *Urban VIII.* examin'd these *Vatican manuscripts*, tells us plainly, that all of 'em which have this *Epistle* of *St. John*, want this seventh verse: tho, out of respect to *St. Cyprian*, he was for keeping it in *. Of which, *Dr. Clarke* has given an account, in the place already refer'd to; together with an account of sixteen manuscripts (eight of them in the King of Spain's library) collated by the *Spanish Marquis*, *Peter Faxard*, (as *F. Simon* names him) and publish'd by *La Cerda*, in his *Adversaria Sacra*, c. 19. from all which manuscripts nothing is alledg'd to justify their vulgar version, in keeping this verse. How then could *Dr. Mill* presume so strongly, that the *Complutensian* editors kept to their manuscripts here? *F. Simon* saw the contrary, and says they follow'd the reading of the *Latin* copies here; and to vindicate it, have inserted a note from *Aquinas*, in the margin.

(3.) He pretends the seven manuscripts of *Robert Stephens* do warrant the words to be genuine. *Stephens* tells us he made use of fifteen manuscripts in his edition of the *New Testament*, only seven of which he has set down in the margin, as wanting some, at least, of the words in dispute: hence it was concluded formerly, even by *Dr. Mill* himself, as well as others, that the other eight wanted nothing, but had the whole, as we have it. To this, the Doctor's remarkable words cited from his *Prolegomena*, by *Dr. Clarke*, are a complete answer;

swer; shewing that those *eight manuscripts* did not include *this Epistle of St. John* at all; and so were of no concern here. But Dr. Mill was sensible of this, in his *Dissertation* on the *text*, where he says of these *eight manuscripts*, *Reliqui has Epistolas non exhibent*. And therefore he urges but the *other seven*, which are noted as wanting only ἐν τῷ ὕψανῳ, *in heaven*, and authorizing the rest; *The Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one*.

But as Dr. Mill was too judicious not to see thro' this mistake, in placing the *little mark*; so he fairly owns his doubt about it, in his *notes* on the verse: *If indeed the little book be placed aright*, says he*. For this depends wholly upon placing the *semicircle*, which marks the words that are wanting in such *manuscripts* as are noted in the *inward margin*. In *Stephens's fair folio edition*, this mark or *small book* falls after the words ἐν τῷ ὕψανῳ; as if these only were wanting: whereas it shou'd have been placed after the *whole verse*, as F. Simon observes, (or rather, after the words *in earth*, in the *eighth verse*: which, the Doctor owns in his *notes*, was the case of the *most* and *best* copies; and F. Simon intimates the same in his remarks upon the *Louvain Latin Bible* by Hentenius, which had the like error :) and I wonder the Doctor should say upon it, *Nescio qua autoritate, neque dicit se istos libros consuluisse*; or that he had not consulted the copies, when he expressly said, *he had consulted the manuscripts of the King's library*: and I think it was there *Stephens* found his †. It appears by Dr. Mill's account in his *Prolegomena*, that *four* of these *seven* manuscripts were in the *French King's library*; and since F. Simon could find none there, that

Crit. Hist.
part 2.
c. 9.

* Si quidem Semicirculus suo loco fit collocatus; which Lucas Brugensis had said before.

† Regia Bibliotheca suppeditavit, *Proleg.* p. 117.

that wanted *only* the words *in heaven*, nor any one else pretends to find such elsewhere, I may safely conclude 'twas a mistake in placing the mark in *Stephens*, which the Doctor was willing to take hold of. And the same *Stephens*, in his *Latin* edition of the New Testament, (as *F. Simon* tells us, *Crit. Hist. part 2. c. 11.* and as I have seen) included the *whole passage* within the mark. So that I think the case is plain, that all *Stephens's* manuscripts wanted *this verse*.

'Tis probable *he* put it into his own edition, from the *Complutensian*, and we from *his* into *ours*; (so one error begets another, by presuming too well of the care and faithfulness of such as went before) for the Doctor tells us, *Stephens* govern'd himself by the *best* manuscripts: but then he says, *He always judg'd those to be best* Proleg. which agreed with the *Complutensian*. Else it^{p. 117.} would be very strange, that all *Stephens's* manuscripts should differ from all them of *Erasmus* and *Simon*, and others; as they must, if only *ἐν τῷ ἑρμηνεύει* were wanting.

And whereas the Doctor lays a stress on *Stephens's* saying *he departed not one letter from the best and most of his copies* *; I would ask then, how he came to put in the *ἐν τῷ ἑρμηνεύει*, *in heaven*, when every one of his *seven* manuscripts wanted them? 'Tis plain *critics* are not always to be trusted in what they say of their own fidelity: the Doctor was right in inferring that it *ought* to have been as he said, but 'tis plain in fact it *was* not so.

Thus having examin'd all his pretences to the *Greek manuscripts*, I think it fully appears there is not so much as *one* found to authorize *this passage*,

* Ne in una litera discesserit à meliorum & plurium codicum suffragio.

sage, nor one antient *version* made from the Greek, and for others, they are not of value in the case. Indeed the Doctor has dealt more fairly than our common unaccurate *Commentators*; who, without any examination talk roundly of *many*, the most antient and the best copies, which have *these* words, not knowing what they say; whereas he pretends but to *few*, and rather supposes and hopes, from some hints in others, that they had such copies, than knows of any himself.

Part I.

Let me close *this head* with the very pertinent remark of the most learned *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*, against the *discourse of free-thinking*: *The present text was first settled almost 200 years ago, out of several manuscripts, by Robert Stephens, printer and bookseller at Paris; whose beautiful and generally speaking (it seems, not in all points) accurate edition, has been ever since counted the standard, and follow'd by all the rest. Now this specific text, in your Doctor's (Whitby's) notion, seems taken from the sacred original in every word and syllable; and if the conceit is but spread and propagated, within a few years that printer's infallibility will be as zealously maintain'd, as an evangelist's or apostle's.*

Dr. Mill, were he now alive, would confess that this text, fixed by a printer, is sometimes by the various readings render'd uncertain, nay, is prov'd certainly wrong; but that the real text lies not in any single manuscript or edition, but is dispersed in them all.

SECT. II.
The Latin
writers.

I now come to the *second head* of his arguments, viz. from antient testimonies of the *Latin* writers, *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*.

Tertullian.

As for *Tertullian*, in the words already set down, he had only said, speaking of the *Father, Son, and Spirit, these three are one*; and 'tis writ-

ten, the Father and I are one. But the former of these he says from himself, not as any part of Scripture, as he says the next words are. And indeed he needed not to have cited these latter words at all, if the former had been of the same authority; for they had been sufficient, whereas the latter words were not to his purpose for proving the Holy Spirit's unity with the Father and Son. Only not having a text for the unity of all the three, he was willing to alledge these words for the two, as a step to the other.

Nor can it be thought, but that in so voluminous a writer we must have had that text many times over, on several proper occasions, if he had known it as such. He repeats John 10. 30. I and the Father are one, very frequently, even five times in a few pages in his book *contra Praxeas*, and again *contra Hermog.* and *de Oratione*. Whereas this pretended text, so much more for his purpose, he omits: which could hardly have been, if he had taken it to be of as good authority as the other text. And therefore Dr. Mill had reason to urge it but softly, saying, Dr. Bull and Dr. Hammond putant se alluisse, suppose that he might allude to the words of St. John: which is but a conjecture, instead of a proof.

So that St. Cyprian is left alone to bear the Cyprian. weight of all. And indeed 'tis easy to see the Doctor's chief confidence is in his testimony, (with a little help from Tertullian, whom he owns to be not so clear) insomuch that he says, This is evidence enough of the words being authentic, tho' none of the Greek writers ever saw them, and tho' they never appeared in any copy to this day. It seems then 'tis to no purpose to withstand this Evidence; or rather it seems, having nothing else to trust to, the Doctor was resolved this must and shall do the business.

Cyprian's

De Uni-
tate ec-
clesiæ.

Crit. Hist.
c. 18.

Cyprian's words are, *Of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, it is written, These three are one*; (the other testimony, in *Epist. ad Jubaianum*, is but like *Tertullian's* supposed allusion to the text, and may have the same answer.) Upon these words the question is, Whether Cyprian refers to the *seventh* verse in dispute, or to the *eighth* by a mystical interpretation of the *Water*, the *Blood*, and the *Spirit*, as signifying the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Spirit*? Father Simon is out of doubt for this latter, and brings a strong proof of it from the words of *Facundus*, who was of the same *African Church*, in the *fifth* Century; and who not only himself so interprets the words of the *eighth* verse, but expressly adds, that St. Cyprian so understood them too, in this very place. Says he, * *Of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, he (St. John) says, There are Three that bear witness on earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood; and these Three are One: by the Spirit, signifying the Father, by the Water, the Holy Ghost, and by the Blood, the Son. Which words of John the Apostle, St. Cyprian the Martyr, in his book of the Trinity, (Unity it should be, as F. Simon observes) conceives to be spoken of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. And tho Dr. Mill would make light of this testimony, 'tis without all reason, and from mere necessity: since this will overturn all he had to say from the Latin Fathers.*

What

* De Patre, Filio, & Spiritu Sancto, dicit Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra, spiritus, aqua, & sanguis, & hi tres unum sunt; in spiritu significans Patrem, in aqua Spiritum sanctum, in sanguine vero Filium significans. — Quod Johannis apostoli testimonium beatus Cyprianus in epistola sive libro quem de Trinitate (de Unitate rather) scripsit, de Patre, Filio, & Spiritu Sancto, dictum intelligit. *Facundus pro Defens. Trin. Cap. l. i. c. 3.*

What *Facundus* says, is so far from being improbable, that the Doctor himself owns *St. Austin*, who was of the same *African church*, did make the same interpretation afterwards; and after him, *Eucherius* declares it was a common exposition of those words: and then why might it not be *Cyprian's*? Does not *Facundus* expressly say it was? Does he tell an unlikely story? Why is it then *letis momenti*? Truly the Doctor thinks none, till *St. Austin*, made *this* mystical interpretation, and therefore not *St. Cyprian*. But why might not *Cyprian* begin it as well as *Austin*? *Facundus* tells us, he did interpret so, and it does not appear that he had any other such words to apply to the Trinity, but *these*. Is it not as good an argument against the Doctor, to say, that *Cyprian* did not cite the *seventh verse* in dispute, because *that verse* never appear'd in any writer till the *fifth century*, as *his* is, viz. That *Cyprian* did not so interpret, because *that* interpretation appears not till the *fifth century*? Only I can prove my assertion by a proper positive testimony, that *Cyprian* did use *this* interpretation; whereas he had *none* to prove that *Cyprian* met with a *special copy* of *St. John's Epistle*, which had *that verse*.

'Tis true indeed, *he* alledges for the other side *Fulgentius*, contemporary with *Facundus*, saying,
 * *St. John testifies there are three that bear witness in heaven, the Father, the Word, and Spirit; and these three are one: which also St. Cyprian, in the Epistle of the unity of the church, confesses; alledging from the Scriptures, that of the Father, Son, and*

* *Fulg. cont. Arianos, sub finem*, Beatus Joannes testatur, dicens: Tres sunt qui testimonium perhibent in coelo, Pater, Verbum, & Spiritus; & tres unum sunt. Quod etiam B. M. Cyprianus in epistola de Unitate ecclesiae confitetur, dicens — De Patre, Filio, & Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, *Et tres unum sunt*.

and Holy Spirit, 'tis written, And three are one. But as *Facundus* is as good an evidence as *he*, and more particular, so even *this* does not contradict *Facundus*. For *Fulgentius* and *he* both say the same thing, viz. that *Cyprian* confessed St. John's testimony of the Father, Son, and Spirit, These three are one. Only *Facundus* tells us, that he took this testimony from the eighth verse, which he so interpreted, and *Fulgentius* does not say it was otherwise; and therefore there is no reason to oppose him to *Facundus*. *Cyprian* might own the same thing as is now contain'd in the seventh verse, tho he deduc'd it from the eighth: he that supposed the spirit, the water, and the blood, in St. John, to mean the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, as much confessed this doctrine, and from St. John too; as if he had found the very words Father, Son, and Spirit, in the text. And this is all which *Fulgentius* himself says of him. Neither of them says that *Cyprian* found in St. John, the words Father, Son, and Spirit, besides the three witnesses in the eighth verse. No, it was there he thought he might find the Father, Son, and Spirit, mystically represented. And I observe two things to confirm it.

I. *Fulgentius* speaks of it as a remarkable confession in St. *Cyprian*, *Quod etiam B. Cyprianus confitetur, which also St. Cyprian confesses*. Confesses what? that St. John had those words, the Father, Word and Spirit, and these three are one? Was that such an acknowledgment, if he found those very words in his copy? No, but he acknowledg'd the Father, Son, and Spirit to be one, out of St. John, by a mystical interpretation of the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, which are there said to be one. This indeed was somewhat far-fetch'd, and not so clear a point, but St. *Cyprian's* confessing it might give it some credit; but it could give

give none to an undoubted *text* of St. *John*, to say *Cyprian* acknowledg'd it to be true. I will not say the Doctor had any design in it, but I find in reciting *the words*, he has happened to change the *confiteatur* into the more convenient word, *contestatur*.

2. I observe, *Cyprian's words* are not the exact words pretended to be found in St. *John*; for *Cyprian* says, *Father, Son*, (not the *Word*) and *Spirit*. Now tho' the *same person* may be intended by *both words*, yet 'tis plain there could be but *one* of them in the *text*. And therefore, if our present *printed text* be right, *Cyprian* had no such copy, or else he did not keep *strictly* to it: and if he did not cite the words *exactly*, only the *sense* of them as an interpreter; then in such a loose way of speaking it might well be, as *Facundus* says it was, viz. his *sense* of the *eighth verse*. So that the Doctor was too forward in saying that *Cyprian* could not have cited the words of St. *John* (as we have them) *more exactly*, if he had had them before his eyes. Besides, *Cyprian* does not say, that the words *Father, Son, and Spirit* were written: All that *Cyprian* says was written is, *Hi tres unum sunt*, *These three are one*; that this was said of *Father, Son and Spirit*, is only *Cyprian's* interpretation.

Let the interpretation be never so forced, that is nothing, so it was; and there are enough as strange interpretations of *texts* in the *Fathers* and in St. *Cyprian* himself, to satisfy us this is no good evidence it was not *his*†. And why may not *Cyprian* father a weak interpretation as well as St. *Austin*? Nor was it unusual with *Cyprian* to cite Scripture more by *his sense* of it, than by the strict letter of the *text*. Thus, instead of *Lead us not into temptation*, he cites it, *suffer us not to be*

Cypr. de
Orat.
Dom. c. 4.

† See Dr. Whitby's Dissertat. de S. Script. Interpretat.

Cyp. de
Bono Pa-
tientiae,
c. 15.

led, &c. Again, he cites *Rev. 19. 10. Worship thou the Lord Jesus*, instead of *worship thou God*. Will any say, upon this, that *he found* a particular copy which had *these* readings? No surely, but rather that it was *Cyprian's* exposition of the true reading in *all* the copies. Even so, I doubt not, his words, *the Father, the Son, and Spirit, these three are one*, was his sense of the *eighth verse* of *St. John's fifth chapter*.

Hist. of
the Ca-
non, vol. 2.
p. 78.
Crit. Hist.
N.T. part
1. c. 18.

I shall conclude *this* with Mr. Du Pin's judgment upon the case: 'Tis not then, says he, *absolutely certain, that Cyprian hath quoted the seventh verse of St. John's Epistle*. And Father Simon's, who says, 'tis out of doubt that he hath not. Tho' 'tis probable *this* mistake of Cyprian's words led some following *African writers* into the opinion that *St. John* had said them *expressly*.

And thus I have *fairly* accounted for *St. Cyprian's* words, without the supposition of his having a *special copy to himself*. And then I think there is not *one* tolerable pretence left of any *ancient* authority.

Victor
Vitenfis.

As to *later* testimonies they do not deserve any notice: Only with relation to *Victor Vitenfis*, because the Doctor lays such a stress upon it, as if the urging *these words*, in a confession of faith, so publicly presented to *Hunnericus*, in midst of the *Arians*, in the year 484, was a good proof that *they* had been well known and receiv'd; at least, *ante unum seculum aut alterum, an age or two before*; and so will carry the evidence much higher than the year 484: therefore I shall take some notice of this, and shew that in fact it was not thus, as he plausibly imagines.

What the credit of *Victor's* history, as we have it, is, I cannot well tell: I know it has found little with many, in the relating of strange miracles, not unlike those of *Monkish legends*, viz. of several who could speak freely and articulately,

when

when their tongues had been cut out by the roots; and sending his reader to *Constantinople*, for an instance to prove it; with other miracles. But let that be as it will, I shall take it for granted, that he says true, in the matter before us; that in the creed presented to *Hunericus*, this text was cited as from St. *John*. But that it had not been commonly and long receiv'd, and well known as such, I think is plain by what the Doctor could not deny, viz. That St. *Augustine*, *Eucherius*, and *Cerealis*, in the same age, and two of 'em of the same country, knew not of *this text*. *Eucherius* lived within thirty years of the time when this creed was presented; and the Doctor tells us, he says it was common in his time to interpret the *Spirit*, the *Water* and the *Blood*, of the *Father*, *Word*, and *Spirit*; as did *Austin*. Now if *this text* had been receiv'd then, what place had there been for such a mystical interpretation of the *three witnesses* on earth? Nay, *Cerealis* was one of the *African* Bishops at the same time, probably; for he flourish'd in the time of the persecution under *Hunericus*; and who drew up a confession of faith also, at the demand of the *Arian* Bishop *Maximinian*; and had the same reason to have made use of *this text*, as *Eugenius* †, if it had been current, as the Doctor insinuates. Where then is the *Seculum unum aut alterum*, the age or two before, in which *this text* had been admitted? I rather think it must only have been some private composure, tho it might be in the name of the other Bishops, who were now scatter'd and banish'd. It is signed only à *Gasis Medianis Episcopis* Biblioth. *Numidia*; *Bonifacio Foratiansi*, & *Bonifacio* Patrum. *Gatienensi*, *Episcopis Vizacenis*. So that it carries the evidence no higher than to *that time*, viz. that

† The Bishop of Carthage, who presented the confession of faith to Hunericus.

that at the latter end of the fifth century some pretended *this for text*, which had been only an interpretation.

SECT. III. It remains that we see how the Doctor accounts for the difficulties that lie against him from all the Greek copies and Fathers before and after Cyprian, who knew nothing of *this text*: how then had Cyprian such a particular copy above all others? Does the Doctor clear himself as fairly of this, as we have of his objection from Cyprian's words?

He puts very proper queries here: *If these words were in St. John's original, how comes it to pass that for three ages following the Greek Fathers had it not in their copies? How came Cyprian, an African, to know it, when it was unknown to Irenæus, who was a very curious inquirer into all learning, (which is Tertullian's character of him*) and who convers'd with Polycarp, the disciple of St. John himself? But in answer to these queries, he is forced to frame many unreasonable suppositions; he knows not which way it was, but he can imagine how possibly it might have been, and then seems to believe it was so. Let us hear his own account.*

If we ask how came *these words* to be wanting in all the known Greek copies? he answers, by mere chance, and carelessness of the transcriber who, cast his eye upon the word μαρτυρες, or witness, in the eighth verse, instead of the same word in the seventh; and so went on, unawares omitting the one μαρτυρες, or witness, and all the words between them both. And then by reason of persecution Christians were in haste, and staid not to revise the transcript, nor to compare with one another's

copies,

* Curiosissimus omnium doctrinarum explorator, Irenæus. Tertul. cont. Valent.

copies, which were but few, because of the pains and expences of transcribing: and the original being at a distance from them when dispers'd, they could not examine by that.

I grant, mistakes of *this kind* have happen'd to transcribers, where *ὁμοιότέλευτα*, words of the same ending, or the same words have often occur'd: but that it was not so here, is plain, because the transcriber had *then* taken the next words to the second μαρτυρῶντες, which are, ἐν τῇ γῇ, in earth: whereas the Doctor confesses *these* words were wanting also. This he was aware of, and therefore *supposes once more*, that the words in earth might be in the first transcript, but that the next time it was transcrib'd, or soon after, it was thought *those* words were superfluous, and so were left or dash'd out *: and then copies were taken by other churches, and so they spread abroad thro Greece, Egypt, &c. And this is the reason that the *ancient versions* and *writers* knew nothing of *this text*, because there were none but these *maimed copies* among all the Greek churches †. But in process of time, he thinks, some *correct copies* which lay hid in Asia (where the original was) or some other parts, some way or other got into Africa, which Tertullian and Cyprian saw: and the times being troublesome, few copies only were taken for the use of the African churches, where they seem to have continu'd; and about 100 years after they became common, else the African Bishops would not have alledged these words in a confession of faith, if they had not been in their common copies, and in the body of St. John's epistle, more than one or two centuries. And about

VOL. II.

K

250

* Curato hoc uno, ut verba ἐν τῇ γῇ tanquam *superflua* deleerentur.

† Nullum omnino codicem Ecclesiæ Græcis in usu fuisse credo, nisi qui ad mutilatos, quos dicimus, descriptus sit.

250 years after Cyprian, the *spurious Author* of the *disputation*, falsely ascrib'd to Athanasius, perhaps might meet with a perfect Greek copy: and then all was set right. And so we have his answer to another question, viz. How the true copy at last came to light again?

I believe *this* account will satisfy very few: if any man should trace his pedigree after this manner, thro' such a train of wild *suppositions*, and improbable imaginations of this and the other *bare possibility*, I fear he would still pass for a *spurious pretender*. And yet *all this* the judicious Dr. Mill could seem to believe, rather than this *one supposition*, which is also well *attested*, that St. Cyprian's words were *his* interpretation of the *eighth verse*: for allow but this, and there was no need of racking his invention at this rate. And I'll appeal to men of candor, which of the *two* is more probable; that *all these suppositions* should happen, or that *Facundus* should say true: especially when these few *remarks* on the Doctor's imaginary account, shall be duly considered.

1. Why should *he* suppose, they who were at the pains or expence, and had leisure of transcribing, would not be at a very *little more*, to review and examine their *transcripts*? which is so natural and usual, in matters of much less moment than what concerns the interests of another life, which to the *primitive Christians* were very dear. While they had the *original* in their hands, it was easy to be done. Surely they were not so careless as the *Doctor* makes them to be: it appears what sense they had in early times, of the necessity of comparing *such transcripts* with the *originals*, by *Irenæus*; to whose writings this *solemn adjuration* is annex'd: *Adjuro te per Dominum Jesum, ut conferas postquam transcripseris,*

&c.

&c. I adjure thee who shall transcribe this book, by the Lord Jesus Christ, and by his glorious appearance to judge the quick and the dead, that thou compare after thou hast transcrib'd, and amend it by the original very carefully. To which purpose St. John's words, Rev. 22. 18, 19. are probably to be understood, as a terror to all negligent and deceitful transcribers of his books,

But the Doctor pretends the persecution of the Christians, and their not daring to assemble but in the night, might hinder them: so far were they from having leisure to review their books, that they could not assemble but before day*. As if this hinder'd them from examining or comparing their copies at home. Must they needs do it in a public assembly? rather was it not much better to be done in private? Therefore the Doctor has another imagination to help it out; and that is, that Christians were in such eager haste to catch the sacred copies, that they carry'd them off as they were†. As if, after so much pains or expence for a copy, they would not take care to have it right. Besides, if the desire was so great, then we may conclude the transcripts were very many, of so short an epistle. And since all the Transcribers could not make the same mistake, nor many of them, I ask,

2. Why must only this one defective copy be carry'd away into remote countries, to become the fruitful parent of all the copies in the world that we can find; and all the others stay behind, or never be heard of more? Is this likely? Were not the possessors of the other copies (which he supposes there were) as much persecuted and

K 2

scatter'd

* Adeo non vacabant recensio*n*i librorum, ut ne quidem convenire iis licuerit nisi ante lucem.

† Libri cum primum exarati, avidissime à Christianis ar-
repti sint, et in varias regiones distracti.

scatter'd as the possessor of *this one faulty copy*? And if they brought away *theirs*, surely there would have been some *more* and *better* signs of them than what is pretended from *Cyprian*.

3. Had not the *Christians* of that time often heard St. *John's* epistle read to them, before they had it transcrib'd, as well as after? *This* was the constant practice of *their* assemblies, to read some part of the *Gospels* and the *Apostles* writings, as *Justin Martyr* and *Tertullian* tell us in their *Apologies*: which the *Apostle Paul* expected, and sometimes requir'd to be done; *Col.* 4. 16. *1 Thess.* 5. 27. Therefore if there had been an omission in the transcript, would not some or other easily have miss'd so memorable a passage as *this text* contains? 'Tis so singular and remarkable, that the omission could scarcely be unobserv'd, when they came to read it over again.

4. Why should he suppose again (to back his former hard supposition) that any *Christians* would so evilly treat the sacred Scriptures, as to strike out the words in earth, for seeming to be superfluous? Had they so little reverence for these sacred records, as to dash out what they liked not? And yet with *those* words the sense and context are no way disturb'd: there are an hundred texts which contain words more seemingly needless, and more hard to be accounted for, and which may as well be spared, if we make our own fancy the judge, as *these words*, which have indeed no difficulty at all in *them*; and yet I am well satisfy'd those *Christians* never would, nor did presume to dash them out of their copies, upon this slight pretence, that they were *superfluous*.

5. Doth *Cyprian*, after all, say one word of any such thing, as his having had a better copy than the rest of the churches had? Not a word; and yet

yet one would think he should not wholly forbear taking *some* notice of so happy an event. Or do any after *him* say they found such a correct copy, or that ever they understood *he* had one? And what became of this valuable *treasure*, after it had got into these safe hands? For,

6. How came it that St. *Austin*, so long after *him*, in a neighbouring church, knew nothing of *this matter*? and that in his disputes with the *Arians*, none should let him know what might have been so serviceable to him? In such times of eager contests, it must have soon *flown about* into the neighbourhood, when adjacent *Bishops* so frequently met and confer'd; and the *rather*, because *Cyprian*, and others after him, must know that *other copies* were defective in *this place*, and therefore it concern'd them to send intelligence to all round about them, how the *true text* stood: and yet the Doctor grants that St. *Austin* knew not of it. And therefore I think it very apparent there was *no such thing* as *Cyprian's* having *such a copy*, notwithstanding the Doctor could say *certissimum est*, upon no manner of evidence but *his* using *those* expressions which are already otherwise accounted for; and of *which* Mr. Du Pin says, *it is not certain that St. Cyprian quoted St. John's words*; and Father Simon, that without doubt he did *not*.

By these things it appears, that Dr. *Mill* not only could not give any true account, how it *really* came to pass that all the *Greek* manuscripts and writers should be ignorant of *this verse*, and yet *Cyprian* recover it from the *original*; but that setting his imagination to work, he could not so much as *invent* or contrive a way, how it could *possibly* be done, with any tolerable *shew* of probability, or consistency of circumstances.

Since therefore he has made such a *surprizing*

conclusion in favour of *this text*, so unsuitable to his premises, and against all the rules of criticism; in preferring one copy to all the copies besides; one Father to all the Fathers; nay rather, without one copy, rejecting all the manuscript copies; and setting one supposed, at best but dubious, testimony of one or two Fathers against all the certain evidences from all copies and all the Fathers for near 500 years: I say, since it is thus, I cannot wonder at the remark made by the famous *Le Clerc* upon the *Doctor's* great candor and justice in stating the evidence, and his strange caution in concluding against it; in the preface to *Kuster's* edition: * If Dr. Mill (says he in relation to *this text*) hath not concluded here like a judicious critic, yet certainly he hath shown himself to be a candid and ingenuous man, in producing the arguments which effectually overturn his own opinion; nor would I impute it to his want of judgment, that he was not moved by the weight of the arguments, so much as to a sort of men, who are wont spitefully to reproach those who freely own the truth; as if they favour'd I know not what heresies, merely because they will not argue against 'em from corrupted texts. Truly the best men are sometimes under a necessity of giving way to the froward, which we must forgive.

See letter
of Mr. La
Croze,
Postscript
to the Re-
ply.

And yet at the same time I willingly consent, that his great learning, his indefatigable labour,

* Si acutum Criticum hic se minimè præstitit *Millius*, at certè ingenuum et candidum virum se ostendit, in proferendis rationibus, quibus sententia, quam ipse amplexus est, evertitur. Nec tam ejus judicio ascripserim, quod rationum pondere se permoveri non passus sit, quam *iii* qui liberè veritatem professos malignè infamare solent, quasi hæresibus nescio quibus faverent, quia nolunt eas depravatis locis oppugnari. Scilicet, optimi quique viri factiosis nonnihil concedere necesse sæpè habent, quod facillè ignoscimus. *Clerici Epist. de Editione Milliana.*

his accurate *judgment*, and worthy *design*, in this noble undertaking, shall not fail to perpetuate his high esteem, and very honourable remembrance to *remotest ages*. Nor indeed is his judgment given in *this point*, but with the modesty of one ready, upon *better information*, to alter it; which he seems to suspect there might be ground for, in the close of *his Dissertation* *.

C H A P. IV.

The Address to both Houses of Convocation.

W H A T E V E R restraints Dr. *Mill*, in his private capacity, might lie under, from declaring his mind more *openly*, they affect not your *Lordships* and the *reverend Clergy in Convocation*; whom, with all the respect due to so *venerable* a body, and with the humility of a *supplicant*, I beseech to consider of this matter, as in *the sight of God*; whether here be not sufficient evidence that *this text* either *certainly*, or at least very *probably*, never was *originally* in the *holy writings* of St. John, but unwarrantably *thrust in* in later times. And if so, whether from the conscientious regards you bear to the sacred Scriptures, they ought not be purg'd of all such *injurious additions*. In order to which, permit me, I pray, without the least *affectation* of being your *monitor*, or the *arrogance* of an assuming *dictator*, humbly to bespeak your very serious thoughts upon these following *considerations*.

1. Whether *such* evidence, as is brought against *this verse* before us, would not be judg'd by you sufficient against *any* passage in *any classic* author whatever? Would not such a passage pre-

K 4

sently

* Meliora, si quid melius certiusque dederit longior dies, discere parato.

sently be pronounc'd *spurious*, and be brought under a *deleatur* by the unanimous voice of the *critics*, when they had no concern in it, but to judge what is true and genuine, and *what not*? Nay, would a *court* of judicature allow any *paragraph* to be good, in a writing of consequence, *for which* no more, and *against which* so much can be fairly said? And will not the *same* sincerity and impartiality well become us in *this*, which we can not only well justify, but commend in the examination of *other* writings? Shall we press men to take that for evidence *here*, which will pass *no where else*?

2. Whether an awful regard to that dreadful *anathema*, or denunciation left on record by St. *John*, Rev. 22. 18. against all who *add to*, or *diminish from his* writings, will permit *you* to be unconcern'd in the matter before you? It cannot be supposed that *those* words shou'd not, at least by parity of reason, concern *his other* writings, as well as the *Revelation*; especially when we remember how *general* the precept was, not to *add* nor to *diminish*, Deut. 4. 2. Prov. 30. 6. The threatening is very *severe*: *God shall add to him the plagues that are written in this book*, are words of so much *terror*, as will sufficiently justify your *Lordships* and the *reverend Clergy's* utmost caution to avoid them; whatever more careless people may think or say. Whether the keeping in an unjust *addition* to the word of God, when 'tis *our part* and in our *power* to rectify it, comes or not within the *prohibition*, none concern'd can think below their sober consideration. It might perhaps *come in* with less guilt thro ignorance, than it can be *kept in*, when the fault is discover'd.

The *Oracles of God* are a sacred *depositum* lodged with the church; Rom. 3. 2. *To them are committed the Oracles of God*; in *this* trust surely, that

that they be kept inviolable, and be transmitted to posterity *pure and clean* from all known *human additions*: whose authority is so infinitely inferior to the words of God, that they ought not knowingly to be intermix'd therewith; especially by those who are the *stewards of the mysteries of God*, and who expect that others should seek the law at their mouths; of whom 'tis requir'd that they be found faithful.

Our twentieth article tells us, *The church is the witness and keeper of Holy Writ*: and therefore must not bear either false or uncertain witness in so solemn a matter, as to say, that is Holy Writ, which she has the greatest reason to judge is not such. 'Tis a dismal thing to have it said to your flocks, *Thus saith the Lord, when the Lord hath not spoken it*: and a hard task it is on him that reads this in the church for St. John's words, who doth not believe it to be such.

3. Whether the *honour and interest* of our holy religion will not be better serv'd by disowning ingenuously what we find to be an error, even tho it have long pass'd as current as truth? Weak people, I confess, may be apt to cry out of innovation (as upon all sorts of reformation) *That religion is subverted, that all is uncertain, &c.* Archbishop Laud once made this sad complaint: * *When errors are grown by age and continuance to strength, they which speak for the truth, tho it be far older, are ordinarily challeng'd for the bringers-in of new opinions: and there is no greater absurdity stirring this day in Christendom, &c.* This indeed may grieve a good man; but must truth and piety therefore be sacrificed to the ignorance and perverseness of men? Must we then prophesy to them smooth things, only because they love to have it so; and not acquaint them with their errors,

* Preface against Fisher.

rors, because they'll murmur against us? I remember St. Paul once made some of his friends to become his enemies, by telling them the truth, Gal. 4. 16. God forbid that any of his successors should be so discourag'd by it, as not to tell the truth, for fear of making men their enemies. If so, we should appear to take more care of ourselves, than of the interests of Christ and his religion.

Pardon me, if I speak with *humble freedom*, what I think not of without *real grief*, that *this false notion of peace* has often well nigh ruin'd religion. Christianity had never come in, if our *blessed Master* had stifled the truth for fear of disquieting the family, by *dividing the father against the son, and the mother against the daughter*, Luke 12. 51, 52, 53. This political wisdom, which is *first peaceable*, and then, or never, is pure; is just the reverse of that *wisdom from above*, which is *first pure*. If it be possible, we must live peaceably with all men, Rom. 12. 18. but, we can do nothing against the truth, says the same Apostle, 2 Cor. 13. 8. *ἡ ἀλήθεια* must give place to *ἡ δόξα*.

For true religion is never more *in credit*, than when her votaries, and especially her guides and teachers, who minister in her holy offices, deal sincerely and openly in things appertaining to God: *Not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully, but by manifestation of the truth commending themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God*. Not by putting false colours upon what they know they cannot justify, or seeking to deceive men in sacred matters; which being once discover'd, *weak minds* are apt to think the worse of religion, for *what* is none of *her* fault, but is acted in a plain violation of *her* laws.

Nothing

Nothing will tend more to *harden unbelievers* in their *unjust* suspicions and reproaches, than to see that no amendment can be obtain'd upon the most *manifest* discovery of an error; but that *right or wrong*, their teachers and guides will *continue* with resolution, what they find *came in by mistake*. What will it avail for honest men to *study* and inquire after *truth*, when the *convincing* of men will not make them *reform*? As if reformation was such an *unreasonable* thing, that it were better to *continue* our faults, when *they* can't be *for-saken* with a general approbation.

In the case before you, 'tis *too late* to conceal the evidence *against the text* I have treated of; it has been *long* observ'd, *oft* objected, and much needs satisfaction. And if *your Lordships* and the *Reverend Clergy* shall please to instruct us, by *better evidence*, that there is *no wrong* done to the *text* of St. *John*; or, being convinced that *there is*, shall hereupon promote a just alteration of *this* in our *printed books*, according to *all the Greek manuscripts*, that so *your people* may see that, at least, you take it for *doubtful*; will not *this* upright method shew to the world, that you are *fair* and ingenuous beyond exception, and that you seek after *truth in the love of it*? This shall convince *them* that you are their *faithful* guides; which will enable you, in a very *serious* and not *far distant* hour, with St. *Paul*, (*rich* and *happy* in the *inestimable treasures* of a good conscience) to make that triumphant boast, *That with simplicity and godly sincerity, and not with fleshly, or worldly, wisdom, by the grace of God, you have acted towards the world, and towards your flocks.*

I think I may safely add, that *what I propose*, will greatly silence the *cavils* of the *anti-scripturists*, when they object the *different readings* in the

the several copies of the *New Testament*. To which 'tis a very good answer, that *these* differences are only in *circumstances*, or in matters of very little consequence to religion; and which it is morally impossible should be otherwise, in a book so oft transcrib'd, and in so long a tract of time. In other instances 'tis truly so; the differences are very small, as Dr. Mill's collection of the various readings doth abundantly shew. But would not *this answer* be somewhat clearer and stronger, if justice were done to the text in the point I have argu'd? I know not *one instance* which interferes with the abovesaid answer so much as *this*. How shall we say that *this text* is of small consequence in religion, which is so oft alledg'd by preachers and writers, as of eminent force in proof of a fundamental article of Christianity? Is it not pity we should needlessly leave them such an unjust pretence? Were it not better to cut off all occasion from them, who seek occasion to censure the holy Scriptures, when we can so truly and justly do it? because there really is no difference in the Greek copies, but all of them agree in wanting *this verse*; so that the objection appears stronger than it is, or than it ought to appear.

4. Doth not the *sixth article* of our church exclude *this verse* from being a part of those holy Scriptures which she receives? for it tells us, that by the Scripture she understands those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the church. Is not the case the same with any part of those books? And will any venture to say there never was, or that at present there is not very great doubt of *this verse* in the church? Whereas if there be any doubt for it, 'tis the utmost that can be made of Dr. Mill's Dissertation.

5. Whether

5. Whether in our printed bibles some words are not omitted, or by a smaller or different character visibly distinguish'd as doubtful, for which there is far greater authority, than for those under consideration? Nay, this is done in this very Epistle of St. John, ch. 2. v. 23. Dr. Mill has shown that those words, *He that acknowledges the Son, hath the Father also*; are in several valuable copies, and antient versions, and in the Fathers, even in St. Cyprian too: and yet being wanting in many other copies, the wisdom of the church hath mark'd them for dubious, to shew how cautious she was there, not to put wrong or uncertain Scripture upon her members. Yet here is a text in the same Epistle, which has not one quarter, nay, I think I may truly say, has not any of that authority for it; and which was once in the same case, distinguish'd by smaller characters, as of less certain authority, from the beginning of the reformation: and now the former caution is withdrawn, this is advanc'd into the rank of *undoubted text*, whereas the other is left as it was. Which however serves to shew us, what we may fairly expect in reason should be done, by such a text as has nothing, even of that lesser evidence, which hath not yet advanc'd the other into the *undoubted text*. If there had not been some more occasion for one than for the other, 'tis possible they had both remain'd in the same state. Therefore,

6. It may reasonably be enquired, whether there be any more evidence for this text, since the Reformation? The present current notions of the Trinity were receiv'd then as much as now, perhaps more; and yet as Luther would not put this into the text in any edition of his German bible, nor durst Bullinger take it in, so our old bibles in Henry VIII's and Edward VI's time, had these

words of the *seventh verse*, and the words *in earth*, in the *eighth*, in small letters, and sometimes in a *parenthesis*; to shew they were not to be esteemed of the *same certain* authority with the other parts of the *Epistle*, because the *manuscripts* wanted them. In Queen *Elizabeth's Bible*, 1566, I find the *same*; and *her* later Bibles were the *first* which took them in, as they now are, between 1566, and 1580. but whether by the influence of the *Convocation* which interven'd, I know not. And if it was a *dubious text* then, some may ask what *further* evidence arises since to have caused this change? Has any *antient* valuable *Greek manuscript* newly appear'd? Yes; the most valuable of all, the *Alexandrian manuscript*, has since that time been brought among us: but alas! *this* has added great weight to the evidence *against it*. Besides, *Erasmus's British copy*, and the *Complutensian Testament*, and the mistake about *Stephens's seven manuscripts*, were not understood to be so void of all weight, as *now* they appear to be. If the first reformers then had *as much* evidence for it, and thought they had *more* than we can now think *we* have, and not so much to say *against it* as *we*; and yet *they* judg'd it but just to leave it *doubtful*: how is it that we shall justify *their* successors, who have ventured upon what *they* dared not to do?

Nay, if your *Lordships* and the *reverend Clergy* don't think this *text* to be *certainly spurious*, I would humbly propose, whether it be not *most likely* to be *so*? And then whether it be not safer to put it *out*, than to keep it in the place 'tis in? Nay, whether it be not at least *dubious*? and then whether it ought not to be mark'd as *such*, for your people's observation? I beseech you, let us but obtain *so much* as I think *yourselves* will, and as the *first* reformers did see to be just and reasonable, or convince us that this request is not *so*:
else

else what remains, but to sit down, wonder, and despair? 'Tis but an easy step, and will be well warranted, to return to that which our *first reformers* wisely and unblameably did. It can be no reproach to be as just to the people as *they* were; and to return again *with reason*, to that which has been alter'd *without reason*.

7. Lastly, the great *importance* of the subject matter of *this* much-doubted text, well deserves your most impartial judgment upon it. The *doctrine of the blessed Trinity* is purely dependent on *revelation*; variously understood by *Christians*, both of the *Clergy* and *Laity*; and bound upon the *Members* of the church by very *direful anathemas*, scarce any *more* terrible, except that of St. *John* against such as shall *add* to or take from *his* writings. Now since it is to the Scriptures, that you make appeal for *proof* of this Doctrine, and for the *right understanding* of it; it is most just that in so solemn a matter you warn your flocks not to be misled, by mistaking an unwarranted modern *addition* for an *inspired oracle*.

I pretend not to make any interpretation of *the words*, till their authority be prov'd: but most judicious expositors understand *these three* are *one*, of an *unity of consent*, or in witness-bearing; as *Bullinger*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, and many other, both *Protestant* and *Popish* writers.

But let 'em signify much or little, in the controversy about the *philosophical* nature of the *three persons*; yet as *they* are always likely to be drawn into the service of what is most *prevalent* and current, so it is certain the common people have their eyes upon *this*, more than on any *undoubted text* in the Bible, in *this* controversy. And *so far* they must be deceiv'd, *if it be spurious*. And it is in *your Lordships* and the *Clergy's* power to let 'em know it, and to refer 'em to
other

other texts, which you can assure them are genuine.

Nor is there any doubt to be made, but the people think *some* branches of the *Liturgy* have their main foundation on *this one doubted text*. When they hear, *three persons and one God*, in the *fourth* petition of the *Litany*; and *who with thee and the Holy Ghost ever liveth and reigneth one God*, in the *Doxologies*; they think nothing in the *New Testament* so like it as *this dubious text*. And will you not think it great pity, that your people shou'd build so weighty things on such a slender foundation, if *yourselves* so judge it?

I speak *this*, because I know not any *other* text that *directly* or *clearly* says the *same* thing, viz. that *the Father, Word and Spirit, are one*. They are not join'd in one *doxology*, nor indeed do I find *any* given to the *Holy Spirit* in the *New Testament*, either *jointly* or *separately*; much less is the *Spirit* said to be *one with the Father and the Son*. I read of *one Spirit, one Lord, one God and Father*, Eph. 4. but not that these *three are one*. And if there be no *other text* which says *this*, it is not the *more likely* to have been St. *John's* saying here; but the *more grievous* to have it inserted by any who had not *his* authority.

Whether, upon the whole, *this passage* shall by your direction, in our *printed books*, be fairly *disown'd* and *mark'd* as formerly, or better *vindicated*, I know not: but if *neither* of *these* be done, and if preachers and writers still go on, without due regard to *justice* and their *own esteem*, to urge *this* as an *authority*, after all that is said to shew it has *none*; I apprehend, there are many understanding *Christians* will be apt to think they are not *fairly* dealt with.

And

And I hope it shall not be thought to proceed from any want of due veneration for your Lordships and the reverend Clergy, if an high esteem of the learning, the judgment, integrity, and hearty zeal for our holy religion and the sacred Scriptures, which they are persuaded dwell with an English convocation, shall excite many of your people, as well as of the Clergy, to some expectations in this matter.

I shall only set down the advice and request of Bugenbadius, a Lutheran Divine: having observ'd this verse to be put in, without any reasonable pretence of authority, and having exclaim'd against it as an impious bold addition to the sacred Scripture, and what (he says) establishes the Arians blasphemy, and therefore suspected was their contrivance; he concludes, * I beseech the printers, and such learned men as are aiding to them, that when at any time hereafter they shall reprint the Greek Testament, they leave out that addition, and so restore the Greek to its former purity, for the love of truth, and the glory of God.

With which request, I humbly hope your Lordships and the reverend Clergy will see great reason to comply; and the rather, because I am instructed by a very great † Prelate (who was once the head of such a convocation, and very tender of the church's honour) That the church is not so bound up, that she may not, on just and farther evidence, revise what may in any case have slipped by her. Whether this be not one of those cases, is submitted to your impartial and discerning judgment.

* Obsecro igitur Chalcographos et eruditos Viros qui Chalcographis adsunt, ut cum rursus posthac N. Test. græcè excudendum est, illam additionem omittant, et ita restituant Græcæ suæ priori integritati et puritati, propter veritatem, ad gloriam Dei. *In Exposit. Jonæ.*

† Abp Laud's Preface against Fisher.



A POSTSCRIPT, in answer to the excuses offer'd to take off the force of this address.

I Am persuaded the *address*, I have made to your *Lordships* and the *reverend Clergy*, is for the matter of it so reasonable and necessary, and may with so much good conscience and justice to truth be comply'd with; that I am embolden'd again to renew it, with the earnestness which becomes a matter of so great importance to the honour of our holy religion.

It might indeed in your wisdom seem meet to wait a-while, to see what could be said in defence of *the words*, which are charg'd to be an interpolation of the true and sacred text, before the convocation should determine what to do with *them*. But since no man has attempted it to any purpose, and all seem silent under the imputation of so great a wrong done to the holy Scripture and the Church of God; and since I can learn nothing from the public, either from the *convocation* or the press, why our common bibles should not in this place be regulated according to the true original, as I have humbly propos'd; I have inquired in private what any of the Clergy or others have to say in excuse of it. And tho I do not think the reverend *Bishops* or *Clergy* in convocation will abide by any such slender *apologies*, yet for the satisfaction of private persons,

I will set them down here, and consider the force of them.

Excuse 1. There is no need to urge this matter any farther, say some, because *this text is given up already*, and is allowed by learned men not to be genuine.

Resp. These men do indeed confess that the text ought to be given up, as past all just defence; but 'tis very wrong to say, 'tis enough that a few learned men know it. The Bible is a *public* book, for the use of all, and is translated for the use of the unlearned; and for their good it should be set out free from all known corruptions. And the learned, who know this *text* is to be given up, should honestly let the world know it too, who are as much concerned as they. But 'tis never *given up* fairly, till it be left out of our printed copies; nor is it declared to be *dubious*, till it be again marked in small letters. Let a difference be made between what is given up, and what is not so, lest some think other even genuine texts be given up too, tho they stand unmark'd, since this stands so. But alas! 'tis vain to say 'tis given up, while 'tis read undistinguish'd in the church, and urged from the pulpit, in proof of a *fundamental* point of religion: and while commentators still deliver it as their opinion that 'tis genuine, and according to the true *original* of *St. John*. Which Dr. Wells, tho without answering the arguments against it, and therefore without just reason, has not feared to do, in his late Exposition of this *epistle*; and yet he is one who has appear'd in the controversy this *text* relates to, and has had the arguments against its genuineness laid before him, in Dr. Clark's letter to him, and therefore ought to have considered this matter, and if he could,

to have answered the arguments that lie against his bare assertion.

Excuse 2. Others say, *the words may stand as they do, because if St. John has not said them, yet other texts say the same thing.*

Resp. 'Tis not so; as has been said already, p. 160. I never found any seriously pretend to it; only that they could by *consequence* infer the like, as they imagined; and others deny it. And must a *doubtful consequence* of one text be thrust into another part of Scripture as *express* text? What Scripture shall we have at this rate, if every Church or party may put their disputable interpretations into the sacred text? Some may think *three infinite minds* to be proved by good consequence (as they imagine) from some texts; others that *three infinite modes* are the three persons, *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*: shall this therefore be put into the text, *viz. And these three infinite Minds are one, or these three infinite Modes are one*? I see not but the same apology would serve them as well, as it does in the present case. We are not seeking what other texts may *imply*, but what *St. John* has *expressly* said.

Excuse 3. Others say, that *St. Cyprian* (on whose mistaken authority the cause has chiefly rested hitherto) *does however own the sense of these words, if he did not find them in the text*; since he makes it the interpretation of the next words, in which he judg'd *St. John* to have said the same in effect.

Resp. What if *St. Cyprian* did suppose so, *viz.* that the *Water, Blood, and Spirit*, might be accommodated to the *Father, Son*, (for he does not say the *Word*) and *Spirit*? Shall *St. Cyprian's* little fancy be put into the text? Is *St. Cyprian's* authority as good as *St. John's*? I inquire what

St.

St. *John* has said, and these men tell me only what *Cyprian* says. If *Cyprian* had any good reasons for such an interpretation of the three witnesses in the *next* words, I hope they will still be heard, when produced ; and so long as this *text*, about the *Water, Blood, and Spirit*, stands undoubted, there will always be this proof of the *Trinity in Unity* left safe and sound for the followers of St. *Cyprian*, in all the clearness and strength it had in St. *Cyprian's* time. But then let it only be proved from these genuine words of St. *John*, and let not the suppos'd *inference* be thrust into the text, to make it pass more current ; since a human inference may with modesty be questioned, when a divine oracle is immediately assented to as sacred.

Excuse 4. Lastly, Some think it best to have it pass for the *printer's* fault, in omitting to put the words in small letters, as was usual, without any order.

Resp. But are not the reverend *Bishops* and the *Clergy* the overseers both of the Church, and of the sacred *depositum* of the *holy Scriptures*, that they be kept undepraved for the edification of their flocks ? Have they not had time sufficient, these hundred years and more, to espy this fault, and to amend it ? Nay, 'tis plain they have approv'd it, for 'tis read in the church as sacred Text ; 'tis oft preach'd on, and alledg'd in proof even of what is accounted the most fundamental article of the Christian Faith. Add to this, that our Bible has been revised and amended by the new translators, since this interpolation crept in ; and yet they have continued it as it was. So that I think the fault is taken off from the *Printers* ; and where it ought next to be laid, is an inquiry which I humbly hope your *Lordships* and the reverend *Clergy*, in faithfulness

to your flocks, and in love to the truth, and at the earnest desires of the very *Laitie* *, will by an effectual and timely amendment of the mistake wholly supersede as heedless : that instead of such poor excuses and evasions, men may be taught honestly to confess the truth, and to be content with the sacred Text, as God and his Holy Spirit gave it, rather than desire to have it amended, better to suit their own schemes and fancies.

Psalms 119. 128. I esteem all thy precepts to be right, but I hate every false way.

* See the Layman's Address to the Bishops and Clergy, pag. 18. *We flatter'd ourselves, some or other of your learned and most venerable order would have given an answer to that inquiry, (i. e. into 1 John 5. 7.) but instead of that, we have of late been alarmed with reports, that a very learned Critic, a member of the lower-house, Dr. Bentley, Master of Trinity-College, being an Archdeacon, is upon an edition of the Greek Testament, and intends to omit that Text, And we see nothing in defence thereof, but a short letter written on that occasion to the Doctor, by a Layman. This therefore we humbly pray may be taken into consideration.*



CONTEXT
AND
ANSWER

TO
Mr. *Martin's* Critical Differ-
tation on 1 *John* 5. 7. *There are*
Three that bear Record, &c.

SHEWING

The Insufficiency of his *Proofs*, and
the Errors of his *Suppositions*; by which
he attempts to establish the Authority of
that Text from *supposed* Manuscripts.

1718.

C O N T E N T S.

The Preface, wherein of Dr. Calamy's angry sermon.

The Introduction.

C H A P. I.

The disadvantages Mr. Martin labours under.

- I. *In not being able to produce one antient genuine Greek writer who cites the text.*
- II. *Nor one antient Greek manuscript, where the text is this day to be found.*
- III. *Nor one credible witness, that says directly he had ever seen such a manuscript.*

C H A P. II.

- I. *The state of the old Latin Bibles.*
- II. *St. Jerom's pretended preface.*
- III. *Of the old Italic version, and the testimonies of Victor Vitenfis, Cyprian, and Eucherius.*

C H A P. III.

Of the pretended Greek manuscripts in later ages.

- I. *Laurentius Valla, Caietan, Complutensian editors; and Erasmus's Codex Britannicus.*
- II. *The Louvain Divines, and Father Amelot.*
- III. *The Berlin manuscript.*
- IV. *R. Stephens's manuscripts.*
- V. *The supposititious works of Athanasius, and the confession of the modern Greek church.*

C H A P. IV.

Mr. Martin's evasions (or objections) consider'd.



The P R E F A C E.

THIS Gentleman, whom I propose to answer in the following Treatise, has certainly set off his arguments with a great deal of address and handsome flourish. I believe few could have said more upon the point, tho perhaps some would have chosen to say less. The extract of my inquiry in the Hague-journal seems to have given the occasion of his dissertation. I had traced the learned Dr. Mill, *κατὰ πόδας*, to whose accurate labours, little that was new could be added. What few remarks I may have made, to clear or strengthen some arguments, Mr. Martin has not always taken notice of; so that I thought at first he had only seen the extract, till I observed he has cited the pages, which are not inserted in the journal.

I commend his pious zeal for the credit of the Holy Scriptures, but do not think his inference just, viz. that, if the Text in debate be found not genuine, it is rational to suppose the same thing may have happened to some other Texts, whereon the Faith has been founded. For if our Faith be justly founded upon any Text, 'tis because we have better proof of its authority; and if we have not, 'tis not faith but credulity, which is no Christian virtue. And I believe this Gentleman cannot give such another instance of one important Text rely'd on, which is not better

better proved than this; nor admits any one else, not even the passage of Josephus itself, upon such lame evidence. Nor can I think that Man a true friend to the honour of Christianity, who declares it must stand or fall with this, or (if there were such) any other Text in the same case.

Since therefore he agrees to this, that we ought to reject this passage if 'tis not Scripture; and I, that we ought to receive it, if it be so; we are not to fright ourselves with consequences, to engage our passions on one side or on the other, but seriously, and in the integrity of our hearts, to inquire and examine to the bottom, whether it be a part of Sacred Writ or not. Only I must observe, that 'twas not fair to say, It turns only upon the silence of some antient Writers, and the omissions in some Greek manuscripts of St. John's Epistle, and that nothing else can be urged; when we do urge the omission of all the Greek manuscripts, and earnestly desire him to direct us at least to one, before he bars us of this plea, and also the omission in all the genuine antient Greek Writers, as far as appears. And till this examination be over, and full satisfaction given, he should not, I think, have called it one of the most excellent passages of the whole Scripture, lest he happen to give the preference to a dictate of some ordinary and erroneous man.

However I can't say but Mr. Martin has written with decency, and the civility of a Gentleman; but such treatment must not, it seems, be expected

expected from all. For from the pulpit, at a public lecture of Dissenters, I have been very lately attack'd with heavy censures, and angry reproaches, in order to vindicate this contested Text. It seems that Dr. Calamy, on the 13th instant, thought it the best method to begin with mens characters rather than with their arguments, and in effect to tell his people, that very good Men had been for the Text, and some very bad or indifferent ones against it: And then he descended to particulars; viz. Mr. Le Clerc, Mr. Whiston, and F. Simon, as the chief of the opposite side, who for piety and learning were not to be compared with some of the other; tho they are well known to be men of superior abilities, and singular learning, of whom, if on his side, perhaps he would have boasted with as great glory.

As to myself, I only complain, that it was not very charitable in him to say from the pulpit, That tho it's true the Text is not in the *Alexandrian* and *Vatican* copies, yet that I (under the name of the Author of the Inquiry) had such an aversion to that doctrine, that if the Text had been in those copies, and twenty more, (*I think that was the number*) he believed I would cavil against it still; and insinuated to the people, as if I had attempted to huff and hector 'em out of the Text.

I addressed my Inquiry to my superiors in Convocation; and if I did write in a huffing and hectoring manner, I should be very
sorry,

sorry, since I intended to do it with fair arguments and decent respect: but I must leave this to equal judges that have read my Book, and let them pronounce whether my Book, or such preaching, have more of the huff and hector.

'Twas hard he should be so very uncharitably confident, what I would have done, and how I would have acted against the greatest evidence, if there had been any in the case. I'm persuaded he can't shew wherever I have cavill'd against such evidence as he mention'd, in any one point of religious dispute. I can tell of several instances where I have yielded to evidence against my former religious opinions, and against my worldly interest and reputation too: nay, I once valued this supposed Text, as much as I can now any proof of its being spurious; perhaps much more, because I found far more need then to have it for me, than I do now to get clear of it: and yet when evidence did appear against it, I did not cavil.

I appeal to any one of understanding, whether John 10. 30. I and my Father are one, be not altogether as opposite to the opinion of such as are counted Arians, with relation to the Deity of Christ, as this other Text; and yet do I or others cavil at that?

I think this should convince any man who is not too far gone in passion and prejudice, that 'tis difference of evidence makes me willing to admit the one, and reject the other; since there is no more difficulty (and indeed I find

find none at all) in reconciling the one to my opinions, than the other: And indeed I was as easy in my present sentiments while I did not reject this Text, but thought it more probably genuine, as I am since. I think this may satisfy: And yet I don't know but he, that can heartily believe the words genuine without the authority of one manuscript, may think it easy for another to disbelieve 'em, tho' he found 'em in all.

It may be observed how ready some are to inflame their people with indignation and rage against such as differ from them, and that in matters they are no way capable judges of. We know well what the marking men out in the pulpit with odious censures serves to.

I am sorry if these are some of the first fruits of the kind indulgence granted, viz. to fall so foul upon others, even before that was quite finished. I suppose, to censure and lessen by name or marks, is a liberty which the kindest laws never intended: When these provided that Dissenters should not be disturbed by others, it was supposed others should not be affronted by personal open reflexions from them.

Why can't a point of criticism, or history, or an opinion be calmly argued? Can't a man go into a pulpit without heat and ruffle, and there produce his evidences fairly? If he can find none that please him, he need not be forward to undertake it, but should not be out of humour; by which 'tis great odds, but he will expose one more than he intended.

I meddle not with his arguments, for indeed they were deferred till the next; and if his reasons be as strong in his next turn, as I thought his passions were in the last, it will make much more impression on me. And I promise him that if he will try me with but half the evidence, nay with one quarter of the twenty Greek manuscripts, which he concluded I would cavil against, he shall find I am not so perverse as he represented me. And when he gratifies the world with these discourses, if he will come forth as a scholar, or rather as a Christian, serene and ingenuous, and I should judge it requisite to take any notice of them; I assure him I am not so disturbed, but that I really intend to use more temper and civility out of the pulpit, than I have sometimes seen in

2 Tim. 2. it: I remember the servant of the Lord
24, 25. must not strive, but in meekness instruct those who oppose.

I am so sensible that victory, in angry and uncharitable strifes, even for truth itself, however it may gratify our present vanity, is yet inglorious; and so injurious to the interests of our holy religion, that I am ready to fear, what a certain General is said to have reply'd, when congratulated upon a great but costly victory, That a few such victories will undo us.

Jan. 24. 1718.

T. E.

An

*An Answer to Mr. Martin's
Dissertation on 1 John 5. 7.*

The INTRODUCTION.

MR. MARTIN, Minister of the *French* church at *Utrecht*, having published a *Dissertation* in defence of the genuine authority of 1 *John* 5. 7. *There are Three that bear record in heaven, &c.* wherein he pretends to give a sufficient proof of its *authority*, and to enervate the arguments, given by me from Dr. *Mill*, of its being a manifest *interpolation*; I thought it proper to consider what he hath said, and to dispel that mist, wherewith, by specious insinuations, and fine suppositions, and smooth turns, he has endeavoured to impose upon the minds of such as do not thorowly understand the matters of *fact*.

This Gentleman is alarmed to this *Defence* by an opinion of the mighty consequence of this *supposed text* for the support of the *orthodox doctrine*; and is therefore very earnest not to let go his hold of it, tho he pretends indeed the same thing is to be found in *many other places of holy Scripture*; which yet I apprehend he has some distrust of.

For my part, I think I am no way influenced by any such contrary *motive*, in writing on the
other

In loc.

other side of the question, being fully satisfy'd that the words, if *genuine*, were as favourable to those call'd *Arians*, as to any; and clearly would argue against the *Sabellian unity of one single mind*, or *one intelligent being*; because that would make the *three witnesses* to dwindle again into *but one*, and so to lose much of the force of the argument from *three*. And therefore *Calvin* and *Beza* declare, that 'tis not *unity of being* is here spoken of, but *unity of consent and testimony*, which I think will imply *distinct minds* concurring in their evidence, since consent is always between more than one: So that it injures Mr. *Martin's* cause to depend on such a proof; as *Erasmus* says*.

I am only concerned to do justice to the *Sacred Writings*, and to discover what is true in itself, not what is convenient or agreeable to my *liking*. And as my design *at first* was to state the *facts* on *Dr. Mill's evidence*, so I judge I did make it appear that he had left no foundation for the just support of the authority of this *supposed text*: But yet if any new evidence arises, or any well-attested *authorities*, or, hitherto concealed *manuscripts* of credit can be produced, I am as ready as any man to allow them a due regard. But Mr. *Martin* has not tried me, I conceive, with any such matters as these; but with fine *suppositions*, and abstracted *possibilities*, of this and the other thing, which in a matter of fact will not go very far against plain evidence.

He supposes the words in debate might not harm the *context*, nor disagree to *St. John's style*: but what is this to the purpose, to prove that in *fact* they were originally written by *him*? 'Tis so easy by one fetch or other, according to mens various fancies, to wind *almost* any thing into an
obscure

* Hoc non est confirmare fidem, sed suspectam reddere, si nobis hujusmodi lemmatis blandiamur. *Eras. in locum.*

obscure context, when once it is resolved it *must* be in; that I take such arguments to be but trifling supplements, where good reasons are wanting. But then as to what he calls a *third advantage* in favour of the text, viz. That his adversaries cannot produce one single passage from the ancients, whence it may appear that they had any suspicion concerning this text; It may be said that it had been indeed strange, if any had made a dispute about a text, which they had never seen or heard of; which I think is true of the *primitive writers* for many centuries: and for others since, 'tis no wonder if, creeping into *private* books in ages of darkness and confusion, we find no notice remaining of any opposition of theirs to what did not offend them.

On the other hand, there are three great *disadvantages* which Mr. Martin labours and sinks under, and which are fatal to his cause.

CHAP. I.

The disadvantages Mr. Martin labours under :

1. In not being able to produce one antient genuine Greek writer, who cites the text.
2. Nor one antient Greek manuscript, where the text is this day to be found.
3. Nor one credible witness that says directly he had ever seen such a manuscript.

1. **H**E has not produced one genuine Greek writer, that ever cited this text, thro so many hundredsof years. Even the spurious *Synopsis Scripturæ* among Athanasius's works, by saying that St. John shews us the unity of the Son with the Father, gives no ground to say that this uncertain author had this text in his eye; probably it

refers rather to some other passages, to *chap. 2. ver. 23.* or to the 8th verse of this 5th chapter mystically interpreted, &c. However, who, or at what time, this author, whether *Greek* or *Latin*, was, is not known.

2. He cannot direct us to one antient *manuscript* *Greek* copy in the world, where this *text* is at this day to be found; and yet the *manuscripts* have been in very safe keeping with the orthodox all along, so that if ever they had been seen with *this text* in them, they might be so still. If *Arian Kings* and *Emperors* had borne the sway, we should have had it confidently said by men of slight thought, that then it was these *manuscripts* of *Stephens*, and the *British* *manuscripts*, and the *Vatican* *manuscripts*, &c. were alter'd, and the words ras'd out, as now they vainly pretend it might be of old: but who has alter'd them all now since the *Reformation*?

3. He has not produced one credible witness, that ever directly said he had at any time *seen* any one particular *Greek manuscript*, in which *this text* was; or described it by any mark of distinction, by which it may be known upon inquiry after it. We have several indefinite assertions, *that it is*, and that *we find it*, and the like, in *some* copies, as *Beza* and *F. Amelot* speak; but that they saw it themselves, and took it not from others upon loose presumption, is, I think, not once fully manifested: and it signified nothing to mention *Ximenes*, and *Cajetan*, and *Laurentius Valla*, and more such, only to make a pompous show of *names* and *numbers* for nothing; when it is not proved they say any thing to the point in hand: and one may say of them all, as *Erasmus* of *Laurentius Valla*, *Quid legerit, non satis liquet*; *How Valla read, is not evident*. But of this matter somewhat more particular shall be said, when I come to examine

what Mr. Martin says of the *Greek manuscripts*. And indeed, 'tis only on this *third* head that I need much to concern myself; for as to the *two* former points, he makes no great defence; the *genuine Greek writers*, and the *present Greek manuscripts* are not to be found, nor are so much as summoned in for witnesses on his side.

Indeed, Mr. Martin would fain invalidate this *negative* argument from the total silence of the *Greek Fathers*, and that of the *Latins* too, for 400 years, (for he has not proved S. Cyprian's words to be more than his *interpretation* of the 8th ver. as *Facundus*, yea and *Fulgentius* too, as I had shown, do declare them to be) by pretend-
 ing that they might be in *other writings of the antients, which are lost*; or that it might not come into their minds to mention them; even as that text of *baptizing in the name of the Father, Son, and Spirit*, was not mention'd by some of them, in several of their works, where it might have been proper.

But is this like the case we are upon? For as those words were not so peculiarly necessary for their purpose against any adversaries they had to do with; so it is granted, that if they were omitted in one part of the writings, they are still alludg'd in another; or if by one writer, yet they are cited by others, both *Greek* and *Latin*; and also have the concurrence of the *antient Greek manuscripts* to back it all. Now is this, or any thing like it, to be said in the present case? where the *text* in dispute is not once mention'd, neither in one *genuine Greek writer* nor in another; neither in one part of their works, nor in another; and where they had such provoking frequent occasions, as would not suffer them to be, *all* of them, and *always*, forgetful of so proper a text; a text so emphatical and so singular, such an one

that Mr. Martin, and some others, cannot tell how to spare; and where all the *Greek manuscripts*, known to us, are as silent as the *Greek Fathers*, and the *Latins* too for many ages. Can any negative argument be stronger? Or can there be any but negative arguments to prove a negative? And shall it be enough not to answer, but evade such proof by strange suppositions of extreme possibilities of such things, to which perhaps the like never yet happened?

C H A P. II.

1. *The state of the old Latin Bibles.* 2. *Of St. Jerom's pretended Preface.* 3. *Of the old Italic Version, and the testimonies of Victor Vitenfis, Cyprian, and Eucherius.*

SECT. I.
Old Latin
Bibles.

MR. Martin's 2d, 3d, and 4th chapters are nothing but a proof, by a long series from the 14th age backwards to the time of *Charlemain*, that *this text* was in the *Latin Bibles* in these *Western* parts; so that he pleases himself with tracing it up to the end of the *eighth century* in the *Latin* copy: which yet is no more than has been freely allow'd on all sides; I mean that *this text* has from that age been found in divers *Latin* copies, not in *all*, or in the most: the nearer they were to our present times, the more they agreed in this point; and the higher we go, the evidence appears weaker and weaker, till at last, without the help of a strong fancy, we can discern none at all.

And even in these *Latin Bibles* it is confess'd, that *this text* is in various shapes; in some the words *in heaven* are wanting; in others, *these three are one*; and in some the *whole verse*; sometimes the 8th *verse* comes before it, and sometimes it is as in our *present printed books*; some-
time

times it is in the *text*, and sometimes in the *margin*. And tho Father Simon owns the words to be in that antient *manuscript* of *Lotharius*, copied from *Charlemain's Bibles*, yet he says, that it was *Crit. Hist.* greatly disfigured, some words interlin'd, and some of the text, defaced, to substitute other words in their place: c. 18.

So that he might well reckon *this* to be of less antient authority, than the *body* of the copy; and therefore there was no great reason here to triumph over him as contradicting himself.

Such marks of confusion seem plainly to shew, that this *text* had, as yet, been a *stranger* there, and had not any fixed settlement assigned to it, perhaps in *St. Bernard's* time, viz. in the *XIth* age, it might be got in to the *Ordo Romanus*, and the offices of the church, both *Latin* and *Greek*; even as in *England*, I find *these* same words were introduced among the *epistles* in the *Common-prayer* of *King Edward VIth*, without any mark of suspicion, while at the same time, and long after, they were marked for doubtful in the public and common Bibles. So that it does not always follow from a text's being quoted, or being brought into the offices of a church, or placed in the *Bible* itself, that it was received as undoubtedly genuine, because the offices of the church are sometimes apt, as we see, to out-run their *Bible*; and posterity will be abused, if any, in after ages, shall persuade them, that the *English* church of *this* or the last age, prefer'd the old reading of *Psalms* 105. 28. And they were not obedient to his word, merely because it is retain'd in the church's office or *Psalter*; when it is so well known, that all our more common, and publicly authorized Bibles, have for above an hundred years maintained the reading, which is just contrary to it, viz. And they rebelled not against his word. So that it would be a wrong step to suppose our zeal for uniformity

mity had been carried so far as this ; I mean, to an exact agreement of the *church-service* with the *church-bible*.

But what tho this *text* were found to be directly in the Bible of *Charlemain*, which Father *Simon* opposes not? Will this prove it to have been in the *Greek manuscripts* at that time? In the *Latin* for certain it has long been, and is now in many other *versions*; and yet we have not found hitherto one *Greek manuscript* †, by which to justify it: And therefore tho *Charlemain*, about *Ann.* 798. caused the vulgar *Latin Bible* to be review'd and purged of many errors and corruptions, that had crept into it since *St. Jerom's* time; and to that end employ'd *Alcuin* and other learned men of that age, it will not prove they had the authority of any *Greek manuscript* to warrant this text, as *Mr. Martin* would have us to suppose. It is not to be imagined, says he, that these learned men wou'd only consult and compare with the *Latin copies*; they wou'd go, without doubt, to the original *Greek of the New Testament*: and pleasantly asks, if Father *Simon* himself (had he been one of them) would have put in *THIS TEXT* upon the credit of a few copies only among many, &c.

Part. I.
Chap. 3.

But it is absurd to think, the men of *that age* wou'd or cou'd take such measures as the learned of the *present age* wou'd; for as the *Greek manuscripts* were probably very rare, and hard to be come at in the *Western* parts, so the learned of those times had scarce any thing of that critical skill, or *genius*, which these later ages have arrived at, and which is so necessary for such a work: It does not appear that they took the pains to compare with so much as one *Greek manuscript*, which if they had had before 'em as their rule then,

† One is since found at *Dublin*, but is evidently of a modern date. See Reply, cap. 5.

then, and had made such account of, it might probably have been still preserved to us: but as we have no such *manuscript* to be now found, or that has been seen, as far as we know, for any of the ages past between us and them; so it does not appear there ever was such in the world. Nay, if they follow'd one, or a few, even of the *Latin manuscripts*, where different from the *most* and *best*, I think it is no great wonder. I am satisfy'd this has been often done, *viz.* to prefer the reading, that has pleased best, when against the *most* and the *best* copies. Did not the *Complutensian* editors so? Did not *Erasmus* do it? And why might not these revisers under *Charlemain* have the *ansa calumniandi* as much at heart as he had? especially since they might fancy, as others do now, that *this text* might have been omitted, as the preface, under St. *Jerom's* name, to the seven epistles, does suggest; which Father *Simon* judges (and the contrary does not appear by Mr. *Martin* himself) to have been about this same time composed and inserted; and to give it the greater authority, they father'd it upon *Jerom*. Not having any authority to produce from any *Greek* copies of their own to justify their complaint of the *Latin* translators omission, perhaps they might think it best to refer the matter back to St. *Jerom*; especially if they found it already put in any copies of his *Latin Bible*, tho by a late corruption, which carry'd no offence in it to them; this might afford 'em a specious plea, and would prevail upon many others, I believe, to do the like in their case, when there were none to remonstrate against it. So that if they did but as others have done, the whole argument is spoil'd.

And then Mr. *Martin* will fall short of his *conclusion*, *viz.* that from this review of the *Latin Bible*,

Chap. 3.

Bible, Anno 798. there can be no doubt at all made, but this text had been current in the Bibles of the 7th, 6th, and the 5th ages; because, says he, we can't suppose they went by manuscripts of less than two or three hundred years standing; and so they must have had at once before 'em [not, but they ought to have had, &c. as the English translator puts it] both the copies of St. Jerom's Bible, and also them of the old Italic version made in the second century, and which had continued to the seventh, to be the Bible of all the Latin churches: and then concludes, that this clearly shews, the text had ever been in the vulgar version. And thus, by the strength of a vigorous imagination, he is speedily arriv'd, in a manner, at the end of his journey; without being beholden to any the least proof by way of evidence, that these revisers did find, or did say they found, the text in any one Greek manuscript, or in St. Jerom's, or in the Italic version itself; much less that they found it in any ancient copies of credit, that might shew it was no innovation, if it was found in any others.

I do not see but Mr. Martin, without tiring his fancy by a long train of suppositions, might as well have made shorter work, by saying, (for I can't well call it arguing) that we see at present our printed copies have *this verse*; and we ought not to doubt but the world has always been so honest, so wise, so watchful and careful, that it could never have been brought in, if it had not always been in the true copy from the first. But yet, alas, it is too evident, that several corruptions, interpolations, and omissions, have happened frequently, before the art of printing, according to the skill, the care, or the fancy of the transcribers; and for that reason, St. Jerom was put upon correcting the *Latin version* of the New Testament with very great labour and difficulty:

culty; and afterwards we see *Charlemain* caused another review to be made, because of new corruptions; and then in the *tenth* century, the *Sorben* another.

And it is as certain, that such reviews are not wont to set all things right again; that upon a little doubt some things are removed, and others that please better are retain'd upon very slender grounds; so that we must not presume and suppose, that all *was done* which we now think was *fit to be done*.

The truth is, the world has already too long gone upon *suppositions* in this matter, and 'tis that has brought us into this confusion. The learned supposed for a long time, that the *Complutensian* editors had kept close to the *Vatican manuscripts*, especially to that famous and most antient one, recommended to their exact regard by Pope *Leo*; and therefore that they had *this* good authority for putting *this verse* into their edition. But, tho' this is more than Mr. *Martin* has to warrant his confidence in the *Charlemain revisers*, yet, it seems, the learned supposed too much here, since these *manuscripts* are found to want what was supposed to be taken from them. Thus the learned world long supposed that *Stephens* had nine *Greek* copies which had *this verse*, and *seven* more that had all but the words *in beaven*; and what is become of their suppositions? I believe Mr. *Martin* will part with some of them; and yet they were very plausible, and partly grounded on *Stephens's* own, but mistaken account; and yet must we still be treated with such trifling suppositions in the same case, instead of evidence? But there is no end of supposing, on one side and on the other; and I have no fondness for a contest, which not the strongest reason, but the strongest imagination must decide.

I

I shall take my leave of this subject, by shewing only how groundless and false Mr. *Martin's* fundamental supposition is, viz. that the *Latin Bibles*, of the 6th, 7th, and 8th ages generally had *this Text*, from the decisive words of that transcendent *critical genius* of this age, Dr. *Bentley*. *

I formed a thought, à priori, that if St. *Jerom's* true *Latin exemplar* could be come at, it would be found to agree exactly with the *Greek text* of the same age; and so the old copies of each age (if so agreeing) would give mutual proof to each other. Whereupon, rejecting the printed editions of each and the several manuscripts of seven centuries and under, I make use of none, but those of a thousand years ago, or above, of which sort I have twenty now in my study, that one with another make 20000 years. I had the pleasure to find, as I presaged, that they agreed exactly like two tallies, or two indentures; — By this you see that, in my proposed work, the fate of that verse (i.e. 1 John 5. 7.) will be a mere question of fact. — And if the fourth century knew that text, let it come in in God's name: but if that age did not know it, then Arianism in its height was beat down without the help of that verse; and let the fact prove how it will, the doctrine is unshaken. Now if these twenty so antient copies all agree in wanting that verse, (as I am satisfy'd, none supposes they agree in having it) we may see what credit is due to Mr. *Martin's* strongest imagination concerning the copies of those ages: Here is plain fact against his extravagant fancies. And I doubt not, when the Doctor, who alone appears to be

par

* Two letters to the reverend Dr. *Bentley* concerning his intended edition of the *Greek Testament*, with the Doctor's answer, and some account of what may be expected from that edition, p. 24, 25.

par buic negotio, shall gratify the expecting world with his *noble performance*, things will be set in a yet clearer light.

Mr. *Martin's* 5th chap. is an attempt to re-
trieve the credit of the pretended *preface* of St. *Sect. II.*
Jerom to the *seven epistles*; which complains *St. Jerom's*
much of the *Latin* translators of the New Testa-
Preface.
ment, that they had *omitted this verse*, which the
Greek copies had in them. If this had been ge-
nuine, it had been of great weight; but for many
reasons the learned have judged it to be a forgery
in St. *Jerom's* name: some of these reasons Mr.
Martin thinks not to be sufficient, but that still
it *may possibly* be St. *Jerom's* own work. But he
can never give a good answer to *all*, for the *pre-*
face professes him to have restored *this verse* after
such injustice done to it; and declares it to be a
principal support of the Christian Faith, by which
the one substance of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,
is confirmed. But then how comes it, that *this*
Text, in all St. *Jerom's* true writings, where he
contends for *this faith* and searches so much for
texts and arguments, is not once mentioned by
him? Could he omit what he judged the great
rampart of his Faith? Could he always omit,
and always forget *such* a text, which he had
been the preserver and *restorer* of, and would
therefore be more than ordinarily fond and careful
of? Besides, St. *Jerom* surely would never be
guilty of such a false insinuation that all the *Greek*
copies had *this verse*, when the *total* silence of all
the *Greek Fathers* in that and preceding ages,
is an undeniable evidence of the contrary; not
to be answer'd by little presumptions and airy
suppositions.

But Mr. *Martin* uses such an argument, which *Ch. 5.*
he says is very *considerable*, to prove this *pre-*
face was St. *Jerom's* and not a forgery, that I
confess

confess is to me very surprizing. If, says he, the writer of it was a feigned person, who designed to put off his own piece for St. Jerom's, he was certainly not a master of much address, in complaining of unfaithful translations in his time; for no one can produce the least proof, that new Latin versions were ever made in the age 'tis pretended this preface was composed: whereas 'tis plain from St. Augustin, St. Jerom's Cotemporary, that in their days divers had undertaken to make Latin versions of the New Testament, and undoubtedly the complaint in the preface respected some one of those versions; which is a considerable reason to prove it was truly St. Jerom's. Now I can't but think just the contrary; that the feigned author, by this was a man of great address: for if he intended a fiction in St. Jerom's name, it was to be suited to St. Jerom's time, when Mr. Martin says, there were divers versions made; and having said none can produce the least proof of Latin versions made in that age, which this preface was pretended to be composed in, he says, there is plain proof, that in St. Jerom's days there were such versions, which is the very age it was pretended for: but if he means the feigned man should have framed a preface, in St. Jerom's name, that had only been suitable to Charlemain's age, he had been a bungler indeed, tho, with Mr. Martin, a man of address. But if such reasoning as this can confirm him in this opinion, it will be very difficult to conceive how he should ever be unsettled in any thing. May I not say to him, what he, on no reason that I can see, says of Dr. Mill; sure he did not consider what he said, [not, did not think what he said, as the English translation is, Ch. 5. at the end] and his eyes and understanding went not together.

But

But Mr. *Martin* says, 'Tis of no great moment, whether it be granted to be St. *Jerom's* or not, because he thinks it will yet prove *this Text* to have all along been in the Bible; in that the preface *must be allowed to be very antient, and to have been in the Bibles for above 800 Years; and F. Simon supposes it put in by some of those who revised the Bible under Charlemain.* Hence he argues, that if these learned men made this complaint of the unfaithfulness of the *Latin* translators in omitting *this verse*, it is a certain argument of its having been in St. *Jerom's Bible*; else they could not have brought such an accusation.

I grant they could not *justly* do so, unless they knew it had been even in all the *Greek copies* too, which therefore they pretend: but they might do this *unjustly*, i. e. without ground, and upon mistaken presumption, as I have already said; or perhaps upon just such supposition as Mr. *Martin* himself goes upon, when he says, in his 6th chap. that either *this verse* was in St. *Austin's Bible*, or that it *ought to have been in it, because it was in some Bibles of that time.* And so, for ought I know, some *Latin Bibles* might have *the verse* in them in the 8th age, and before; and perhaps the composers of this preface were as loth to think, it was put *lately* in, as Mr. *Martin* is: and contrary to what he says of *F. Simon*, I may ask him, whether if he had been one of *them*, he would not have done the same thing according to his way of reasoning, or rather of *presuming*, without evidence.

But if, from the former evidence of Dr. *Bentley's* words, it appears in fact, that St. *Jerom's Bible* had not *this Text*, then there is an end of this dispute, and the *prologue* could not be his; since, 'tis granted to be *ridiculous*, to suppose he should reproach other translators, for leaving
our

out *this Text*, and yet himself leave it out in that copy to which this *preface* was made : therefore the *preface* is a forgery, and be it whose it will, is of no force to prove that *this Text* had been either in St. *Jerom's*, or in any *Greek copy*. So that the great, and *middle link* of the imaginary chain in the 8th age, is broken, on which hangs the supposition of *such Greek manuscripts*, for about *seven centuries* before, and which supported that supposition for about as many centuries after till matters of fact came to be looked into, and the *Greek manuscripts* themselves inspected ; which, we shall see presently, are all wrong on Mr. *Martin's* side, when I come to consider the few private citations of his *two next chapters*.

SECT. III.
Italic ver-
sion.

Mr. *Martin*, in his 6th and 7th chapters, goes on to prove that *this Text* was in the antient *Italic version* of the New Testament. This he would infer, from its being in St. *Jerom's*, which I hope appears already to be a groundless surmise ; and so the argument will turn on the other side, and be retorted upon him, viz. that if St. *Jerom's* New Testament had not *this Text*, 'tis a great sign, the *Italic*, which he corrected, had it not neither : *Otherwise his Bible had been so defective, that it would have been bitterly exclaimed against, by such as made such ado with him, about his changing but one single word for another ; as we learn out of St. Augustin.*

Victor
Vitenfis.

As for his instances of the mention of *this Text* by *Fulgentius* in the 6th century and by *Vigilius Tapsensis*, I pass them by, as I have done before, as coming too late to be of any great use in the case ; nor can the mention of *this Text* by them or *Victor Vitenfis*, signify any thing more than what I had supposed formerly, viz. that at the latter end of the *fifth century*, some might begin to pretend that for *Text*, which had

so long and currently been the interpretation of the *next verse*. And therefore I did not, as Mr. *Martin* insinuates, put by *Victor Vitenfis's* testimony for being a fabulous writer; but I shewed, (to which Mr. *Martin* hath made no reply) that it was no evidence of the current admission of that *Text*, or of its long standing, and that from the common way, in that age and place, of interpreting the *next verse* in such a manner as could not well consist with having *this Text* also in their *public Bibles*: I say, their *public Bibles*, because as F. *Simon* has shewn, tho it appears not that different *Latin* translations were then read in the Western Churches, yet *private* persons took the liberty of making new translations; and that by this distinction, between the *Bible* read in the public service, and these particular *versions*, we may easily solve the objections taken from *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, &c. whose citations agree not with the *Italic version*. They read the vulgar copy with the people, which was in use in their Churches, because they could not do otherwise: but in their writings, they took the liberty to translate as they thought fit.

Hist. of
versions,
c. 3.

And therefore supposing *Victor's* relation of that *confession of Faith* to be truly as we have it, yet whether drawn up by *one Bishop* or by *four*, it does not follow that *this Text*, even at the end of the *fifth age*, was in their *common Bibles*, tho they might have some *notions* on which they presumed to bring in the words for a proof, and thereby give some countenance to them; whether it was that they had the direct words in several *private* books, or relied on the current mystical interpretation of the *next verse* to bear them out: which last may, for ought I see, be all that is intended in such testimonies or citations of these words. I do not confidently assert it, or say, that even these late writers

writers had only *three witnesses*, in the Bible; which sometimes they mentioned by their direct names, *Water, Blood, and Spirit*, and sometimes by their *mystical* names, *Father, Son, and Spirit*; or *Father, Word, and Spirit*: but I conceive there is some ground to think so from this, *viz.* that while one speaks of the *Water, Blood, and the Spirit*, and another of *Father, Word, and Spirit*, as *St. John's three witnesses*; I have not observed that any of them spake of both together, or of *six Witnesses*: which looks as if it was all but *one Text*, with its interpretation. I confess *Eucherius's* testimony, in the next chapter, has all *six* set down there; but to that I shall answer distinctly. So that for ought appears, *Mr. Martin's cloud of witnesses*, as he calls this huge number of *African Bishops*; every one, says he, coming with his Bible in his hand, offering us this passage of *St. John* to read; may be but a cloud of an hand-breadth, three or four only, without any warrant from the public copies, long established, as it appears by others of that country in that same age, from what has been already said.

Ch. 7.

Cyprian.

The testimonies of *Eucherius, Cyprian, and Tertullian*, are to carry on the proof of the *Italic version's* having *this Text*; but as here is nothing new about *St. Cyprian*, (to which *Tertullian* is but an appendix) so I have already stated the matter concerning him in my former discourse, and have accounted for what *Mr. Martin* here repeats; but he takes no notice that even *Fulgentius*, whom he brings to confront *Facundus*, does rather, as I have shown, confirm his judgment of *Cyprian's* words, *viz.* that they are an interpretation of the *eighth verse*; and for certain they are not the direct words of the *seventh verse* contended for. And yet here is all that is pretended

tended to, from St. *John's* time to the fifth century; for neither *Greek* nor *Latin*, small nor great writer, for so many hundred years, gives the least shadow of a proof, that they knew any thing of this great and remarkable *Text*; perhaps the most obvious, and adapted for their constant occasions, of any text in the Bible. And yet this contested passage of St. *Cyprian* only, so well accounted for otherwise, and upon so good authority, must outweigh all, even against the express testimony and sense given of St. *Cyprian's* words by a following *Bishop* of the same country, whom none contradict, and whose testimony, if believed, is entirely decisive.

But the passage Mr. *Martin* brings out of *Eu- Eucherius*, *cherius*, (of which indeed I was not aware before,) will need more consideration; for tho it only concerns the *fifth century*, in which I did allow that possibly *the words* might become *Text* in some books, yet it will carry it half a century higher, than the *confession* of the *African Bishops* in *Victor Vitenfis*: and, I confess if the passage be *genuine*, it is more to the purpose than any, yea than all the other testimonies, before or after *Eucherius*, for some hundreds of years: because here we find both the *seventh* and *eighth verses together*, at once to shew us all the *six witnesses*; and that there was *Father, Word, and Spirit*, beside what was said of the *Water, Blood, and Spirit*; whereas, only *Father, Word, and Spirit*, might have been the same things mystically interpreted, after the prevailing custom of that time. So that I cannot deny but Mr. *Martin* had some ground to say, *this is decisive*, i. e. as to its being acknowledg'd by *Eucherius*, in the fifth century. But,

The instance being singular, is indeed apt to raise suspicion about it; yet I shall not for that

reason reject it, but shall offer such other arguments, as will, I think, acquit me from the charge of being influenced by mere partiality, in judging it to be probably an *interpolation*, added by the transcriber of *Eucherius*.

In general, the learned know very well, that in the copies and editions, especially, of the *Latin Fathers*, such interpolations of texts are frequent, and were thought innocent: for when the transcriber found a text only refer'd to by his author, he would supply it at large, or perhaps rectify it, by *putting it in* according to what was in his own Bible of another age, which he thought must be right. This was but natural; and I understand this is the case in the like instance with *Bede's comments* on the *eighth verse*: *there are three that bear record, the Water, Blood, and Spirit*; for so I am informed the manuscripts of *Bede's* works have it, whereas in the printed edition, the words *in terra, on earth*, are added to make it agree to the current versions of after-ages. So that if *Eucherius* had only said, *As to the Trinity St. John has spoken as in the eighth verse*, the transcriber finding in after-ages the seventh verse also in his Bible, might join both, as easily as he now would add *chapter and verse*: and thus an alteration of a *Text* was the likeliest of all.

But 'tis not enough to say it *might be so*, I shall therefore offer my reasons on which I judge it was so here; because,

Euch. de
Quæst.
difficil. in
Loca V.
& N. T.

1. *First*, It appears to be not very consistent with *Eucherius* himself elsewhere; for in his interpretation of *Ver. 8.* or the *Water, Blood, and Spirit*, he declares *that most did by a mystical interpretation understand thereby the Trinity*, i. e. by the *Water* the *Father*, &c. in which he seems entirely to acquiesce also; which is much what *St. Cyprian* had said before, according to *Facundus's* testimony. Now I cannot imagine how to

re-

reconcile this with *Eucherius's* acknowledging the words of the seventh verse; for how could any, according to common sense, set themselves, by forced mystical interpretations, to extort from the eighth verse such an unnatural meaning, and make the *Water, Blood, and Spirit*, to mean *Father, Word, and Spirit*, if they had read it directly in the seventh verse already, that there are *three in heaven, &c. Father, Word, and Spirit*? Could they make the three witnesses *on earth* to be the same which had just before been called the witnesses *in heaven*? Would they make the *six* to be but *three* witnesses? and the Apostle to say the same thing twice over? and after the mention of *them* by their proper names, to mention 'em by *mystical* characters, *i. e.* to speak of 'em darkly and enigmatically, after he had spoken of 'em plainly? One would think it not credible that men should use so much force and straining to search for the *Trinity* in the dark, if they had found it lie plainly before 'em, so close and near to them.

2. *Secondly*, It appears that this *treatise of Eucherius de formulis Spirit. &c.* in particular was in very great disorder, and it seems the copies were not alike; for *Johannes Alexander Brassicanus*, in his prefatory epistle, tells us, as I find it in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, that he took a great deal of pains, unto weariness, *in repurgandis & restituendis, &c.* in leaving out and adding many things; *id quod deerat adjecimus*, says he. So that all things considered, it is not improbable that this passage may be one of those additions. To which I may subjoin,

3. *Thirdly*, that this text was not necessary to his design, which (tho I will not say he keeps strictly to it) was to insist upon *mystical* interpretations, like the *Jewish Cabala*, under the several numbers, *one, two, three, &c.* which the

* De numeris quorum significationes in allegoria trahuntur.

eighth verse did serve him in. This appears in the title of this *chapter*, which is, * *Of numbers whose significations are allegorically explained*: whereas the seventh verse was not subject to such a secret figurative interpretation. And accordingly in the beginning of his work, he prays God to reveal the secret abstruse *sense* of the Scriptures, that he might produce what was their secret meaning †. However, I submit *these reasons* to the judgment of the impartial, who, I think, will not wholly despise 'em all: but still it must be remember'd, that if by any they be not thought sufficient to take off the authority of this testimony, yet as it is the first clear mention of *this text* by any Christian writer, so it was not till a good way in the *fifth century*.

C H A P. III.

Of the pretended Greek manuscripts in later ages. 1. Laurentius Valla, Cajetan, Complutenſian editors, and Erasmus's Codex Britannicus. 2. The Louvain Divines and F. Amelot. 3. The Berlin manuscript. 4. Stephens's manuscripts. 5. The supposititious works of Athanasius and the confession of the modern Greek Church.

THERE is nothing now remains to be considered, but what evidence there is to be found from the *Greek manuscripts* of the N.T. to authorize this *text*: for it signifies little that the modern Latin or Greek churches have admitted it, unless they had authority from the *Greek*

† Oremus Deum ut revelet abscondita Scripturarum, & proferamus quomodo secretiora intellectu sentiendum sit.

Greek original for so doing; and therefore this article of the *Greek manuscripts* is of greatest importance in the case.

Mr. *Martin* in his *eighth chapter* undertakes to shew that this *text* was found in the *Greek manuscripts* of these last ages, and says so many things with such undaunted confidence, and positive assurance, (which a wise and cautious man would not say, unless he knew 'em to be true) that if it be found he has said 'em without *truth* and *evidence*, I think it will not gain his work any credit in the end, tho it may stagger the unlearned reader at first. He begins with a fine popular *harangue* upon the old story of its having been in the original *Greek* of St. *John*, and thence passed into the *Italic version*, and so into St. *Jerom's Bible*, and thence into *Charlemain's*; for he says, *We must not doubt but the learned men he employ'd in correcting the Bible had Greek manuscripts to consult.* And indeed if we must not doubt their having such *manuscripts*, nor that they exactly corrected the *Latin* by 'em in every place that differ'd, nor that they really put this *text* in their Bibles; in short, if we may doubt nothing, then the work is done: but Mr. *Martin* knows these things are doubted, yea, and that *some*, or *all* of them, are *deny'd*, and strongly *opposed*: and it is trifling, on no better grounds, to tell us we must not doubt the principal matters in debate.

Next he argues from F. *Simon's* saying, *This passage is in very few Greek copies*, that therefore *he grants it was in several*; which is no true inference at all, because Mr. *Martin*, but a few pages after, cites him for saying the *text* was not in any one *Greek manuscript*; which he calls *contradicting himself formally, and retracting*, &c. but very unreasonably: for F. *Simon* having seen

many manuscripts in which *this text* was wanting, but not all that might be seen, might well pronounce hereupon, that it was not *in the greatest part of them*, and that it certainly was but *in few*, tho he never intended hereby to say *it was in any*. And when he had searched more thorowly, he then ventured to say it was not in any *one*; and therefore those *vain triumphs*, not to say insults, on that *celebrated scholar*, might have been better spared than utter'd upon so slender, or rather no true occasion. And if Mr. *Martin* were not willing to catch hold of any thing, he would never have made an argument of such a poor pretended concession of *F. Simon*, which he knew he disowned, or rectify'd.

Laurentius Valla.

And now he comes to particulars. *First*, He tells us, *Laurentius Valla*, in the fifteenth century, recover'd seven Greek manuscripts—and *this passage of St. John is found in all seven*; and he thinks it is hard if *none* of them was then *four or five hundred years old*: but however he is so modest, as to let them be but *three or four hundred years*. And yet after all this *particular* account, given without mincing, or hesitating about it, I dare say this Gentleman knows nothing of the matter, but speaks all upon fancy and guess. If perhaps you imagine he has got *L. V's manuscripts* in his possession, or at least, that he has seen them fully; he tells you no, not he, nor any man else that he knows of, has *either seen Valla's manuscripts, or knows what is become of them*. Is not this a pretty account? Dr. *Mill* says he had only *three Greek manuscripts*, Mr. *Martin* says *seven*. *Erasmus* says, *How Valla found or read* (this place in *St. John*) *does not fully appear*; Mr. *Martin* says roundly, *this text was in all the seven*; and yet does not know any author who says he ever saw these *manuscripts*, nor produces any words of

Chap. 11.

Proleg.

N^o 1086.

of *Valla's* own, to prove that he saw this text in them.

Next comes Cardinal *Cajetan*, and what says *Cajetan*. he to the point? Truly no more but that he doubted whether *this verse* were in the text; because, says he, it is not in *all the Greek manuscripts, but only in some; whence the difference arises, I know not.* This is much what *F. Simon* had said, as I have observed before; he might not see the words in *any manuscript*, but at that time never questioned but they were in *some*.

Then for the *Complutensian* editors, Mr. *Martin* Complutensian editors. says boldly, that they put *this text* in upon the warrant of *one or more* manuscripts, (he can't tell which) and yet takes no notice of the evidence given to the contrary in *my former Tract*, that they had it not where it was presumed and pretended they had it.

As for the *Codex Britannicus*, by which alone *Codex Britannicus*. *Erasmus* was influenced to put the words into his *third* edition; if *Erasmus* never says he saw it, what signifies it to mention *F. Simon's* saying it? And therefore it was very unfair and unjust to insinuate that I had *call'd in question the veracity of* Chap. i. *this learned man two hundred years after his death*, when I never once suspected his testimony in the least, and only said that I never found he gave any such testimony. And is his credit attainted by not believing any groundless story that others tell of him? Cannot he be thought an honest man, if all that *they* say of him should not be true? Had that great man, who was the wonder and glory of his age, and who laid the foundations for after-ages to build upon, said such a word as that he had *seen it*, I had easily relied upon his sincerity; who, I conceive, was too great to use such falshood and deceit.

Indeed Mr. Martin thinks it enough to say, 'Tis not our concern now to inquire what is become of this manuscript, or if any others have seen it besides Erasmus — and that this method will introduce a new sort of scepticism in matters of learning. But with his leave, I think it does concern us greatly to know whether such a manuscript be in being still, which was too remarkable to be lost in obscurity, if it had once been taken notice of; and whether any one else ever saw it, since it is contested so much whether ever Erasmus saw it, or pretended to it. And I dare say, such a presuming credulity as Mr. Martin propounds for the cure of scepticism, which would hinder a severe examination into facts, would do, and has done, the world far more harm than such scepticism itself; and the longer men go on to take things so on trust, the more grievous will the scepticism be at last.

Stephens's manuscripts are next in tale; but on what mistaken grounds, will be further seen in the review of the next chapter.

SECT. II.
Louvain
Divines.

In the year 1574, says he, the *Louvain Divines*, in a preface to their *Latin Bible*, say they had seen this passage of St. John, in many other Greek manuscripts, as Stephens had in his. As for Stephens's manuscripts, it is plain they only presumed it from what appear'd in his printed edition; but as to what they say themselves saw, I think Mr. Martin is mistaken in interpreting it of any Greek manuscripts: I shall set down their own words, in which he has left out one material sentence, which was both in the *Latin*, and in F. Simon's translation, with what design he best knows: Speaking of *Jerom's Prologue*, * *This*,

* Quod pro textus lectione facit, & Latinorum librorum plurimi suffragantur, quibus consentientes duos Græcos codices unum

say they, makes for the reading of the text, which is likewise supported by very many Latin copies; agreeing with which, Erasmus cites two Greek copies; one of Britain, the other of Spain; || to that of Spain the King's Bible is conformable, as every where else, so here also ||; we have seen many others which agree with these. Now the word *these* may refer to the two last copies, one whereof, viz. the King's Bible, was a printed copy, which shews that they speak of any copies promiscuously; or it may relate to the Latin copies first mentioned †. But why should Mr. Martin pick out the middle sentence only for the reference of these words? and by an unfair omission represent it to his reader as if it were the immediate sentence before these words of reference, *tout d'une suite, immediately following, &c.* He says they are speaking of Greek manuscripts of England, &c. but are they not speaking also of Latin copies, and of King Philip's printed Bible? and perhaps Stephens's manuscripts, which they instance in immediately after, may be some of the many which they saw did so agree to the other. But their own account of them shews how they saw them, viz. as they were mark'd in the printed copy only; and therefore they make some doubt whether he had

This sentence Mr. Martin has omitted.

Printed at Antwerp, 1572.

unum Britannicum, alterum Hispanicum, Erasmus profert; Hispanico ut ubique & hic conformis est Regius: multos alios his consonantes vidimus.

† It matters not much to which the word *these* refers, since in respect of having this text they are said to be all alike; but according to the rules of language (to use Mr. Martin's phrase) it should properly refer to the Latin copies, for it is with these that the British and Spanish copies are said to agree; and the many others must mean others besides the British and Spanish, whether those others were Greek, or Latin, or both, is not determinate, nor is there any thing to confine the word *others* to manuscript copies, but it may as well relate (as our Author here shews it probably does) to printed copies, particularly the Complutensian edition.

had placed *his marks* right according to his *manuscripts*; nay, it is plain that even the copy of *Spain*, which *Erasmus* cites *, was only the *Complutenſian edition*, and is what theſe divines, I think, do intend here; and not a *manuscript*, as *Mr. Martin* turns it.

But I have now before me the New Testament, of theſe *Louvain Divines*, by *Plantin Antverpie* 1584. with the ſame approbation of *Molanus* annexed as in the other edition; and in their notes on this *text*, their words are ſomething different, † viz. *This confirms the reading of the text, where-to agrees the Greek Complutenſian edition, and what are taken from thence, with many others which we have ſeen.* And then follow the words about *Stephens's manuscripts*, as in the other, but it is under the title of the *Pariſian copies*. Now this, which ſeems to be upon their ſecond thoughts, puts it out of doubt that they ſpake only of ſeeing ſeveral *printed* editions of the *Greek copies* beſides that of *Complutum*, but no *Greek manuscript*. And I think it is not *againſt common ſenſe*, as *Mr. Martin* pretends, to underſtand even the former account ſo, if we had not had this *latter*, which makes it more plainly appear. So then hitherto no one is proved to have ſeen any *one Greek manuscript* for this *text*.

F. Amelot. The next evidence he calls is *F. Amelot*, who, in his note on this *text*, ſays, *Erasmus ſaid it was wanting in one Greek manuscript of the Vatican, but I find it in the moſt antient manuscript of that library.* Whether he found it by his own ſearch,
or

* *Eraſ. in locum: Perlata eſt ad nos editio Hiſpanienſis. Again, Exemplar, ex eadem, ni fallor, Bibliotheca (Vaticana) petitum, ſecuti ſunt Hiſpani.*

† *Quod pro textus lectione facit, cui Græca Complutenſis editio, & quæ ex ea ſunt, cum aliis quas vidimus non paucis, conſonant. Inter omnes Pariſienſum ne unus eſt qui diſſideat, &c.*

or others information, these words do not fully determine. Nor does *Erasmus* say it was wanting only in one manuscript of the *Vatican*, but in *Codice pervetusto bibliothecæ Vaticanæ*, in a [or the] very antient manuscript of the *Vatican library*, which he also calls *liber antiquissimus*: and since we are well assured the text is wanting in the famous most antient *Vatican* manuscript, by the concession of *Dr. Mill*, and I think of all that have inquir'd into it, and particularly by *Caryophilus*; and that upon a strict search made by the critics, whom *Pope Urban* the 8th employ'd about it; *Mr. Amelot's* slight testimony that it was in the most antient manuscript there, cannot be consistent with their more accurate and credible testimony. Indeed *Mr. Du Pin* says *Amelot* was not very * exact; and *Father Simon*, upon several occasions, shows how vainly he uses to talk. † *Father Amelot*, says he, does not seem to be sincere, when he speaks of his searching out of manuscripts; and that he speaks of manuscripts which were never extant but in his own imagination: and as to his having carefully searched the *Vatican* manuscripts, he says, he cou'd not affirm it, since he produces no various readings but such as are in print; and that he never saw, but in print, what he call'd seeing the manuscripts. So that I think we may set this witness aside.

His last is a sort of ear-witness rather, viz. 'tis SECT. III. said there is also one (manuscript) at *Berlin* in the Berlin making's library, that is believed to be 500 years old. manuscript. *Father Long* reports it on the testimony of *Saubertus* and *Tollius*; and *Dr. Kettner*, on a letter that he says he received of it from *M. Jablonski*, &c. But *Mr. Martin*, who makes the most of every thing,

* *Hist. of Canon of O and N. Test.* Vol. 2. ch. 3. § 1.

† *Crit. Hist. of Verf. of N. T.* ch. 32, and 33.

thing, does not quite venture to say, that *this text* is reported to be in that *manuscript*, [tho his translator makes him say so ; of which I will not take any advantage, because I think he has done his *author* some wrong] but it has the face of such an artful insinuation. Father *Le Long* says only, there is a *manuscript*, and refers to *Saubert* (whom I have not seen) and *Tollius*, whom I have consulted ; and he only tells us what sort of book it is, *viz.* written in great letters, *Literis uncialibus*, and without accents, &c. but says not one word of *this text* in *St. John* : and if *M. Jablonski's* letter has said no more than these, what is this *manuscript* mentioned for ? If there be a *manuscript* at *Berlin* that *wants this verse*, does this prove the *text* to be genuine ? Or if *Mr. Martin* means, that we don't yet know what is in that *manuscript*, is that an argument for us to conclude, that it is in it, contrary to all the other Greek *manuscripts* that we know of in the world ? Surely the presumption lies on the other side ; and this Gentleman could so easily have gained satisfaction from *Berlin* in this point, that I suspect he was fearful there was no such *verse* in this *manuscript* ; or else he would have come abroad well fortify'd with such an *authority* ; and if so, it was not ingenuous to make such a deceitful flourish in so serious an argument. But if indeed it has the *text*, and we can be assured how the case stands upon that *manuscript*, it will then deserve good consideration, and be of more weight than all the rest that he has offer'd : Till then, 'tis amusing the world with random conjectures, and *unfair insinuations*, to tell them, they say somebody has written to some-body, that there is a *Greek manuscript* which has in it we cannot tell what.

But

But since my writing what relates to the *Berlin manuscript*, I have received information from a very sure * hand, that *this verse* is not in the body of that manuscript, but that it has been since inserted in the *margin*, and the manuscript is not above 300 years old neither. If Mr. *Martin* had known this, and conceal'd it; nay, if he could still not only insinuate this *manuscript* to be in confirmation of his argument, when it was directly against it; but also could even venture to add this vain triumph immediately upon it, *We see here manuscripts more than sufficient to convince us*, &c. (when yet he was driven to such hard shifts, of pretending a false authority to make out but *one* such *manuscript* :) I say, if he had known this, I should think it such an imputation on his sincerity in writing, that I could not tell how to reconcile it to what he had said at the entrance of his *Dissertation*, viz. that he had learned from the *book of Job*, 13. 7. *That we should not talk deceitfully for God*. And if he did not know it, which I'll suppose, his offering it to the world at all adventures with such an air of boasting, is nothing to the reputation of his discretion; and will, I hope, convince him how unfit such a presuming confident imagination is to be brought into an inquiry of this nature. However, if he be still burdened with a superfluity of good *Greek manuscripts*, having *this text*, I conceive they will all be taken off his hands, and not one left him to turn to.

And now upon a survey of all hitherto said, it appears that Mr. *Martin* has scraped together all the things little and great, that he could think of,

* The information was from a good hand, (if I mistake not from young Mr. *Jablonski* then in *London*,) whom the author got a friend to inquire of, but by some misapprehension the answer brought to the author related to the *Latin* and not the *Greek Berlin manuscript*. See more of this in the Reply.

of, that so he might make a huge heap and pompous show of *numbers*; and then with a popular flourish retails them out singly, first by the *names* of the authors who were mention'd about them; *Valla, Ximenes, Erasmus, Stephens*, and *many other learned men have seen 'em*: then by their place, *some in France, some in Spain, some in England, and some in the Netherlands*: and after all this, says he, *Shall the text not have been in the Greek manuscripts still?* And he has the courage to say what I think is one of the strangest things to be said with so great an assurance, *viz. We see here*, says he, *more manuscripts than there is need of, to convince us that this text is not found only in a very few manuscripts, nor only in such as are more modern, as Father Simon wou'd make us believe.* What! more than is needful? and yet after all, not one? How easily are some men satisfy'd!

SECT. IV. In the last place, we are come in his 9th Chap. Stephens's *to Stephens's manuscripts*. It has been shown, *manu-* that of all his sixteen *scripts.* *manuscripts*, (for so many Dr. Mill had allowed besides the *Complutensian* copy, *Proleg. N°. 1179.*) only seven had *St. John's Epistle*; and that all these are found to want *this verse*, tho' by mistake, *Stephens's Greek* edition has marked only the words, *in heaven*, *ἐν τῷ ὐρανῷ*, to be wanting. Mr. Martin being sensible this presses very hard, pretends to set this matter in a clearer light than ever; and undertakes to shew that more than seven of *Stephens's* manuscripts had *this epistle*, and consequently had *this verse*, for certainly they are not among those seven which are marked as wanting it. And he is sorry to find that Mr. Roger, Doctor of *Divinity* at *Bourges*, and writing in defence too of the text, has, after his strict examination of *Stephens's Greek Testament*, (in which his manuscripts are referred to) declared that he

can find but *seven* belonging to *this epistle*; and that not one of Stephens's manuscripts had *this verse*; tho, says Mr. Martin, they have always been accounted a bulwark thereof: and, he says, Mr. Roger has not computed aright †.

But I am amazed to see how weakly Mr. Martin goes about the proof of this great discovery; he mentions three more manuscripts of Stephens, as having this epistle of St. John, not before observed; these are marked *id. 11. 15. i. e. 14. 15. 16.* and he proceeds still upon his accustomed topic of presumption: because, forsooth, all the epistles of the *New Testament*, viz. St. Paul's and the seven *Catholic*, and the *Revelation*, are wont sometimes to make *one volume*; therefore finding by Stephens's Testament that these manuscripts had St. Paul's Epistles *before*, and the *Revelation* of St. John *behind*, he strenuously argues that the seven *Catholic* epistles were surely in the middle. However, since the manuscript mark'd *id.* is referred to, upon 2 *Pet.* 1. 4. which is one of those seven *Catholic* epistles, he doubts not but that manuscript reach'd St. John's epistle also, and says briskly, this makes *eight* manuscripts.

But certainly Mr. Martin cannot be so weak, to think this will pass for a good and *invincible proof* with men of sense. Did he never see an old bible which had beginning and end, and yet wanted some parts between? If he had read and considered Dr. Mill, he would have found it so here; that accurate inquirer tells us often, with exact nicety, what *books*, what *chapters*, and what *parts* of a chapter, are wanting in several of the *manuscripts*. And he tells us these *three* were mutilated; and as to the *last, id.* he is so particular, that he tells us this was a copy of *three*

† But Mr. Roger spoke from actual examination of his own and of F. Le Long, who carefully inspected the manuscripts themselves for this very purpose. See F. Le Long's letter to Mr. Martin 12 Apr. 1720. subjoined to the Reply.

Millii Pro-
leg N^o.

1174,

1175,

1176.

three Gospels, *Matthew, Luke, and John*; but at the end were *two* leaves, in which was a part of *Acts* 10th *chap.* and the first *chap.* of the 2d epistle of *Peter*. One might hope such a great disappointment as this shou'd take us off from presuming and fancying, where *facts* lie so cross in the way.

He brings *Beza*, as one well acquainted, he thinks, with the matter, to confirm this point, viz. That more than those noted *seven manuscripts* of *Stephens* had *St. John's* epistle in 'em, and consequently *this verse*; because he says, *this verse is in the manuscripts of England—and in some of Stephens's antient manuscripts*. Yet I do not think it appears by all that *Mr. Martin* says, but that *Beza* intended it of those aforesaid *seven manuscripts*, which he, as well as others, imagined by *Stephens's* marks to have all but the words *in heaven*; which small defect might yet not hinder him from saying in general terms, the *verse* was there: And tho' after he had said this *verse* is in some of *Stephens's* antient manuscripts, he adds that the words, *in heaven*, are wanting in *seven manuscripts*; it does not follow that he distinguishes these *seven* from the *some* manuscripts before, but only that he expresses the number of *manuscripts* determinately, which before he had expressed indefinitely and uncertainly: And what wonder is it, tho' he did not express himself so accurately in a matter he might be in some confusion about?

But supposing *Beza* did, as perhaps he might, imagine that some other *manuscripts* of *Stephens* had this *verse*; this has been long thought by others thro' mistake, and why might not he mistake as well as others?

For tho' *Mr. Martin* represents *Beza*, as having seen all *Stephens's* manuscripts, and compared 'em
and

and that they were in his hands, &c. and thence infers from Beza's words, that the whole verse was in some of 'em; and afterwards argues, that in the rest of them only the ἐν τῷ ἑρᾶνῳ, in heaven, was wanting; and that Stephens's marks were not wrong plac'd, because Beza, who would have observ'd it, if he had found the contrary to either of these things, appears to confirm it all; yet I apprehend the very foundation of his whole argument is but a mistaken presumption; for it no way appears that ever Beza had all, if any, of Stephens's manuscripts, or that he had the manuscripts of the King's library to compare at all: and tho he uses the phrases *Legimus, & invenimus in nostris; We read, and we find them, &c.* and compares them with the (supposed) *British* copy; yet all this might well enough be without reading 'em any where but in Stephens's own notes and collections *.

And this is most likely, if we consider the case of Beza. Henry Stephens, the Son of Robert,

* It is very common for Authors to say *We read or we find a thing so or so*, when they have found it so only in the printed editions, and never saw the original manuscripts, nay when they have seen them, thro want of attention they sometimes make mistakes; it is therefore no argument, that they had other manuscripts, because in some one place they have not noted the reading exactly, while the readings in other places are as they represent them. — Mr. Martin himself speaks with as positive an air of Stephens's manuscripts, as if he had actually seen them, while yet I believe none of his readers so understand him; nay in quoting *La Bibliothèque sacrée*, a book which he had before him, he calls the Author of it a learned *Benedictin*; altho' in the very title-page thereof he is expressly named *Priest of the Oratory*, (and not *Benedictin*;) we must not however thence infer, (as Mr. Martin does with respect to Stephens's manuscripts) that Mr. Martin had another edition of that book, wherein F. le Long is styled a *Benedictin*. See Mr. Martin's dissertation on this text cap. 2. *sub fine*, and F. le Long's letter to Mr. Martin subjoined to the Reply.

bert, had collected the *readings* of ten more copies, and written 'em into one of the New Testaments of his *Father's* fair edition, which had already so many various readings noted in the margin: this treasure was put into *Beza's* hands, who being thus furnished, seems to have taken little or no further care to make any search of himself into those copies or manuscripts, nor perhaps ever to have seen 'em; insomuch that Dr. *Mill* thought he had reason to say *, *That he took no care to search out what was the genuine text—And when accidentally he treated of it, he did but shew how little or nothing in a manner he saw into those matters, tho otherwise a learned and sagacious man.* How *Morinus* also blames him, may be seen in Dr. *Stillingsfleet* on the *Trinity*, p. 159, &c.

But there need no more words about it, the matter is determined before; for if, as is already proved, *Stephens* had not one *manuscript* of St. *John's* epistle more than the seven which he had marked in the margin, then to what purpose does Mr. *Martin* make ado to force the contrary out of *Beza's* words? viz. that his *some manuscripts* were not of those *seven*, i. e. were none of all he had. So that here is no news from *Beza* of any one *Greek manuscript*, which has all the verse; for these *seven*, he owns, want some words. And let Mr. *Martin* hold to it ever so tenaciously, or reason ever so finely upon it, 'tis either *Beza* speaks wrong, or himself by mistaking him, argues so, since 'tis against plain fact.

And

* N^o 1258. *Proleg.* De hoc enim parum laborat, & ubi de Lectionis cujuspiam ἀσθεντία forte agit, ostendit quam nihil fere in his rebus viderit, vir alias eruditus & perspicax.

And therefore I judge *Beza's* words can do him but very little service, in his 10th chapter, to justify the marks of *Stephens's* edition being rightly placed; it being what he probably never examined into; and *Stephens* himself might not have it suggested to him. It has already been said and manifested, that there is proof of this mistake in *those marks*, from ocular inspection into several of those *Greek manuscripts*, which are found to want the *whole* verse, but not one that wants *only* the words in *Heaven*, as the *Semicircle* is put in *Stephens's* printed edition. This See Full Mr. *Martin* ought to have taken notice of, and Inquiry, then he would have blush'd to say, in the con-^{p. 133.}clusion of his book, that his opposers *alledge nothing but reasonings without proof*, but that *he establishes facts upon testimony*; and, that his adversaries argue from the text's *not being* in the *Vatican* nor *Alexandrian manuscripts*, that therefore it was in none of *Stephens's*. No Sir, we argue, that because 'tis not now found, nor any rasure pretended, in any manuscripts, even not in those which *Stephens* had, that therefore it was not there formerly, and that the *semicircle was misplaced*: So that on our side is the proof from *fact*, on yours from *reasonings* against it; while you bring not one *manuscript* in proof, nor one witness that says he saw such a one upon his own immediate search.

And I would know what made the *Louvain* Divines make the doubt, whether the *semicircle* were in its *due place*? Surely they had some reason for such a particular suspicion. So that I think the Business of *Stephens's* manuscripts stands as I put it before, and Mr. *Martin* has found no evidence of any one *Greek manuscript* here, which yet is his *last* and *chief Refuge*; for as to his *Codex Britannicus*, I think there needs no more

be said to it, than that *Erasmus* either never saw it, or however judged it to be corrupted in this place by some modern *interpolation*.

Nor is that any *insuperable difficulty* which *Mr. Martin* pretends, saying, that *Stephens* should at once have said in the margin, ἐν παλαιῇ, &c. i. e. it was wanting in all, rather than said, 'tis not in this, nor this, nor this, and so of all the *seven manuscripts*, if he had no more. Perhaps indeed that had been the shorter way; but who knows the reasons of mens fancies, or why they chuse this or that way of expressing themselves, when they are at their own liberty? Perhaps when *Stephens* saw most of the verse in the *Complutensian* edition, and in that of *Erasmus*, he was loth bluntly to say so harsh a thing, as that he could find it in no manuscript, and so might chuse to say it more softly, viz. not in such and such: And tho these indeed were all he had, yet *this* was not so obvious to be observed by many, as the other had been, and therefore was less offensive.

But it may be asked, whence then did *Stephens* take *these words*, since he did put 'em into his *Text*? *Resp.* 'Tis enough that we can answer in the *negative* upon good authority, that he had 'em not from any of his *Greek manuscripts*, and then 'tis no great matter where else he found 'em. Probably he took 'em, as he did the words ἐν τῷ ἑξαῶ, from the *Complutensian* edition; only the latter part of the verse not being so agreeable to the *Latin Bibles*, as 'twas in *Erasmus*, from his supposed *British Greek* manuscript, he might prefer the reading of this latter, and take ἑτοίμοι τρεῖς ἐν εἰσι, rather than the οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσι.

Ch. 10.

Nor is it any such *puzzling question* as *Mr. Martin* fancies, viz. Why did *Stephens* observe that

that the *Complutensian edition* had εἰς τὸ ἕν, i. e. agree in one, as peculiar to it, if the whole verse was so? I answer, none can say the whole was peculiar to it, when the *supposed British* manuscript, and *Erasmus's* edition also, had the rest of the verse; and therefore *this part* only was peculiar, and so was fit to be observed.

Mr. *Martin* in *Chap. 11.* is so over-critical in marking the differences of the *Codex Britannicus*, and the *Greek* of the council of *Literan*, that he observes one *considerable difference* to be εἶτοι and τῆτοι, when a very little knowledge of the *Greek* would suggest that it was only an *erratum*; probably the mark over the εἶτοι, a *circumflex* with an *aspirate*, was placed so as to be taken for a *tau* and a part of the word.

I cannot but remark one thing more in Mr. *Martin's* 11th chapter: he tells us, *The Complutensian edition does not teach, as do all the others, the Unity of essence in the three persons, but the Unity of their testimony.* But then, I ask him and others, what they mean by so often vouching this authority? If we grant 'em *this*, then they will gain a *Text* which does not teach the *Unity of essence in the three persons*, but the contrary; and then perhaps they will throw it up again, and be as angry that we receive it, as they were before that we rejected it. Let 'em tell us whether they think we should or should not admit it, or else let 'em never more urge us with the *Complutensian* copy.

The two testimonies which Mr. *Martin* touches SECT. V. on in his 12th chapter are amongst the supposititious works ascribed to *Athanasius*. The first, taken from the *Synopsis Script.* has been observed to be no plain evidence of any regard to *this* P. 69. text, let the author be who he will; and for the other author, Mr. *Martin* does not know but

he was a *Latin*, tho he thinks he possibly might be a *Greek*; but of the fifth or sixth century however, which is not worth striving about; since it can come but to this, that among the multitude of *Greek* writers, one, who possibly might be *Greek*, seems to have some relation to such a *text*, but all the rest are silent; and yet his words τὸ ἐν, will agree to the *eighth verse*, by omitting (εἰς), as much as to the *seventh* by adding the (τὸ): so that *this answer* will remain good against all he has said about the difference of the *Latin* and the *Greek*.

His 13th chapter tells us, that *this verse* is made use of in the *Greek Church*, in her *confession of Faith, Ritual, and Lessons*; which may easily be, and yet be but of late date. If he could shew us they had it in their *Offices* in the primitive ages, 'twere to the purpose; but to say any of their *Offices*, which from age to age have been subject to variations or additions, have it *now*, is to say nothing: and to argue, that if they *took it into the public lesson*, (which is an antient part of the Office) *it must be because they knew it was an omission, and that it ought to be added*; is just the same as to say, whoever put it into the Bible, or any *Greek Edition* of the New Testament, (which New Testament is certainly a very old book) did it because they knew it was a defect, and that it ought to be added; which they could not have thought, if the words had not been in their *Greek Bibles* before, *i. e.* that it could never have come in at all, if not at the *first penning* of *St. John's Epistle*. Which is a pretty short argument, but there needs no great guard against its force, to them who believe an addition or alteration to be no impossible thing. Let *Mr. Martin* prove *this*, and he will carry his point indeed,

indeed *by reason*, which he seems not so likely to do *by evidence of fact*.

C H A P. IV.

Mr. Martin's evasions (or objections) considered.

I Come now to consider briefly his *evasions* of the arguments against this *Text*, which he calls objections, in his *second part*, viz.

1. The *Greek* manuscripts have not *this Text*; Ch. 1. but then, says he, *they want some other Texts also which yet are genuine*. Resp. Some manuscripts may want *one* text, and others *another*; but is there one text of good authority which they *all* want? for so the case is here.

2. The councils of *Nice* and *Sardica* mention Ch. 2. it not: but it was, says he, chap. 2. *because they had no contest about the Trinity, but only the Deity of the Son*. Resp. Very good! But was not *this Text* as much to the purpose for the *Son's* Deity, as for the *Holy Spirit's*, or as for the Deity of all the *three* Persons? Is not the *Son* one of the *Trinity*? and would not a text that should be thought to prove *Father, Son, and Spirit* to be one God, prove as strongly, that the *Father* and *Son* are one? Was it not on all such occasions as good a proof as that text, *I and my Father are one*?

3. The *Greek Fathers* did not mention it; but yet it might, he thinks, *have been in some other of Ch. 3. their writings, which are lost; as the text of baptizing in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit (and some others) is not used by 'em in some treatises where it was proper*. Resp. What is this to our case, where the words are not omitted in *one part*, and found in another, or by

one writer, but found in other *Greek* writers of his age; but are omitted in *all* the genuine works of *all* the *Greek* writers of so many hundred years that have remained? 'Tis a hard presumption indeed to imagine it should be in a great many lost writings, and not preserved in *one* of the many we have, to which they were so pertinent. As for the *Latin* writers, they are accounted for in my *Inquiry*.

Ch. 4.

4. The Fathers who mention the *eighth verse*, and yet not the seventh, says he, *had only occasion for the one, and the other was not proper to their purpose.* Resp. It might indeed happen so in some instances, but not in all. Not in *Cyril*, who had plainly more occasion for the seventh *verse* than for the eighth, in order to prove the *Holy Spirit God*, or to have the *Name of God*. I appeal to any man, if the seventh *verse* be not more likely to answer that purpose than *the Water, Blood, and Spirit, &c.* Not in *Augustin*, for he directly wanted such a *text* to prove his point, *viz. That where two or more are said in Scripture to be one, they are not different, but the same thing*; nothing could have hit his fancy better, if it had been known to him. Not in *Facundus* surely, who urged the 8th *verse* for proof of the *Trinity*, but not the 7th. Mr. Martin says, *he ought to have stuck to this last.* But 'tis certain he did not; and for what reason but this, that he knew not of any such *text*? And also that the *African Bishops*, by using the testimony of St. *John* for the *Father, Word, and Spirit's* being one, intended it only, as he expressly says St. *Cyprian* did intend it, of the mystical interpretation of the *eighth verse*. So that this excuse will not do.

Besides, had they *never* any occasion for the *seventh verse*? Could they find no opportunity for

for bringing in this, *one of the most excellent passages of the whole Scripture*, as Mr. Martin calls it, before he has proved it to be *any* part at all? Where are these instances? What, not once in all St. *Augustine's* ten large *Tomes*! Again, had not such a commentator on St. *John's* epistle, as *Bede*, (the most learned man perhaps in the eighth century) the same occasion for the *seventh* verse, viz. to comment upon it, if it had lain in his way as the other did? Which was all the occasion he wanted, that I know of. Therefore Mr. Martin adds in his fifth chap.

5. *Commentators have always been at liberty to expound only what passages they pleased. Resp.* True, they are so, for none can compel 'em; but I think men are not wont to use their liberty in this manner without some reason, and against reason, and the world's expectation; or without some apology for it, especially in so remarkable a text. *Oecumenius* had no reason to omit it, and *Bede* as little. *Cbrysoftom* indeed might omit or pass over one sentence that was easy and plain, or of smaller importance, or that often occur'd, or the like; and so another might do by others; but how comes it that both *Oecumenius* and *Bede* should agree to omit this same text so very remarkable? Or is there one old commentator that ever did observe the words?

But Mr. Martin objects, *Oecumenius* and *Bede* knew it to be a text received by some; and so had as much reason to say something to it, tho they had not own'd it, and yet are quite silent, against all reason that we can give. *Resp.* This is presuming what is not granted; for *Oecumenius*, being a *Greek* writer, would probably have no manner of occasion to speak of it; forasmuch as this passage does not appear to have been in one *Greek manuscript* of the New Testament to his time,

time, nor mention'd by one genuine and known Greek writer, what reason could he have to say any thing about a matter that had never been in being? Surely it must have been by a spirit of prophecy; for Mr. *Martin* has not shewn it was in *St. John's epistle in Oecumenius's time*, he has only said it, and it had been strange, if he had mark'd a text which he had never seen.

As for *Bede*, the words might begin perhaps to be taken into some private *Latin* copies before his time, in *Africa* or other remote places; yet probably he had never seen or known it; and not having it in his *Latin*, nor in the *Greek* copies, what reason had he to take notice of it? Mr. *Martin* makes a vain supposition, that *Bede* found his *Latin* copy had it; and that if his *Greek* wanted it, he should not have failed to take notice of it; whereas no such thing appears, but rather both wanted it. As for *Bede's* knowing that *Cyprian*, *Victor Vitenfis* and *Fulgentius* had cited these words, this is but a precarious supposition neither; for if this was judged to be only their mystical interpretation of the eighth verse, then *Bede* had nothing to say of it, as of another text by itself.

And indeed, if he had known the words of *St. Cyprian*, and of the *African Bishops*, &c. (which yet does not appear) and had taken 'em to refer to a direct text in *St. John*, yet if he knew of no such text, how could he tell where to insert it, or where to take notice of it, whether in *St. John's Gospel* or *Epistle*? Therefore it were no wonder he should not mention such a loose uncertain matter in *St. Cyprian*. But it had been strange indeed, if finding the text in his Bible, he should omit to comment on that in course, when yet he commented on the rest round about it, before and behind.

So that I think these apologies and excuses are too thin and weak to pass in the world: but the best of it is, the *Fathers* need 'em not, in my opinion; because they had a much more substantial reason for not mentioning *these words*, if they never found 'em in their Bible.

And now I must leave it to the judicious and candid readers to consider, whether Mr. *Martin* had good reason to go off with so much ostentation and opinion of his performance. On the opposite part, says he, *we have nothing but reasonings without proofs; on ours, evident proofs and reasonings upon 'em. We settle a matter of fact on positive testimonies of witnesses, without ambiguity, without exception: they alledge dumb witnesses that can only speak by signs, — manuscripts that have not the text; writers who have not quoted it.*

Where are these *facts*? these positive proofs against which nothing can be said? What, I suppose, the *Berlin* manuscript of 500 years old? and all above the seven manuscripts of *Stephens*, which had this epistle? And where are they? bring forth your witnesses; I doubt they can't speak so much as *by signs*, for there is not any sign of 'em that I can see. And I suppose *Jerom's* preface, and the *British* invisible manuscript, &c. Here are facts indeed alledged, but they are only *supposed* facts, that want confirmation.

The most plausible witness is *St. Cyprian*, which yet is not so plain, but that much is very reasonably said to shew he spake of another text.

They alledge dumb witnesses, — manuscripts that have not the text, says he. But are not negative proofs proper to make out a negative? If one obtrude some new text in print, or a *Mahometan* should urge a text of our Lord's (as is pretended)

speaking of *Mahomet* by name, or παραλῶς; must not negative witnesses confute it, by shewing 'tis not so in any *Greek manuscript copy*, nor mentioned in any genuine *Greek writer* for many hundred years? nor pretended to by any favourers of *Mahomet* in the first setting up their religion? And have we not all this evidence against *this verse*? If I produce a blank paper, does not it prove there is no writing in it, only because 'tis *silent* and *can't speak*?

To conclude, *if it be so in fact*, I hope 'tis no faulty *positiveness* or confidence to say it, viz. That there is not one *old Greek manuscript* of the New Testament, written before printing, yet known to the world, which warrants *this text* for genuine, tho there be a huge number which all want it. So that I hope no candid man will say I am immodest in pronouncing it doubtful, or that I would not receive it, which I am sure I would, if I had sufficient evidence that ever *St. John* had deliver'd it to the *Saints*.



A
R E P L Y
T O
Mr. Martin's Examination
O F T H E
A N S W E R
T O

HIS DISSERTATION ON, I JOHN 5. 7.
*There are three that bear record in
Heaven, the Father, the Son, and the
Holy Ghost, and these three are one.*

1720.

C O N T E N T S.

The Introduction.

C H A P. I.

A true Account of the Berlin Manuscript.

C H A P. II.

Of Robert Stephens's Greek Manuscripts.

C H A P. III.

Of St. Jerom's Preface and Bible.

C H A P. IV.

Of two antient Greek Writers, that are pretended to quote this text and of the Latin Writers.

C H A P. V.

Of the Dublin Manuscript, called Codex Montfortius.

P O S T S C R I P T.

Containing three Letters:

One from Father Le Long, Priest of the Oratory at Paris, to Mr. Martin, relating to Stephens's Manuscripts.

Two from Mr. La Croze, Library-keeper to the King of Prussia at Berlin, relating to the Berlin and Dublin Manuscripts.



A REPLY to Mr. Martin's EXAMINATION, &c.

The INTRODUCTION.

IT is not my design to make this *Reply* equal in length to Mr. *Martin's Examination*: He has mingled so many long historical *narrations* concerning late authors; has introduced his arguments with such flourishing *preambles*; and afterwards confirms them with so many high *commendations*, that I find a great deal which I need take no notice of.

I pretend not to say that I am not mistaken in any accidental matter whatever: and therefore if I neglect to distinguish *Eucherius* from the *African* bishops, when he liv'd in an isle on the opposite coast; or if I had mistaken, in calling the XIth age St. *Bernard's* time, instead of the XIIth, it had been no great matter; for as to this Mr. *Martin* himself had said, That toward the end of the eleventh century St. *Bernard* quoted this text in many of his writings*. And I thought * *Differ-*
I had been very sure that he could not make *lat. ch. 3.*
very many quotations in the age before he was born; and so I ventur'd to say he liv'd in that eleventh age in which he wrote: but Mr. *Martin* corrects me, saying, *nor did St. Bernard live in the XIth, but the XIIth age.* Whereas the truth *Examin.*
of *ch. 5.*

of the whole matter is just the contrary ; for he was born towards the end of the XIth age, (*Anno 1091*, says *Dr. Cave*) so that he did not quote *this text* in the XIth age, which *Mr. Martin* has affirm'd, but yet he did live in the XIth age, which he denies ; so little caution does he use in what he writes. But I pass on to what more nearly affects our main argument.

I observe two things in *Mr. Martin's* entrance upon his work, in his very first leaf, that are a little surprizing :

1. That he should presume to say, p. 2. *That the universal antient church has supposed this text to contain the doctrine of the Trinity of persons in the Godhead* ; when it is *not* pretended to be once mention'd by any one of the antient *Greek* church or writers ; and but once *is* pretended, with any, and that very little, colour, to be quoted by any *Latin* till the *fifth* century. If this amount to a testimony of the *universal antient church*, I dare engage to produce her testimony, and one much more ample, for many strange things which *Mr. Martin* would not believe.

2. I wonder, that when he will not contest against the *Arians* from the last words, *these three are one*, whether they don't mean only an *unity of testimony*, he should yet think *them* distress'd by proving the Father, Son, and Spirit, to be *three persons* from their being *three witnesses* ; and that I, for this reason, *was in a mistake* in saying, the words, if genuine, were as favourable to them call'd *Arians*, as to any ; and adds, *I know not whence he learned that the Arians ever believed the Holy Spirit to be a person really subsisting*. And truly I as little know whence it is that he has not learned it, except it be from his not having look'd much into the controversy, how much or how *forcibly* soever he may have written upon it,

it, as his *preface* tells us. And I dare assure him, that if he have no occasion for *this text* but to prove the *Holy Spirit* a person, those call'd *Arians* will grant him the benefit of it in some other text more express; and he has less reason to seek for it here, where the *water* and *blood* are called *witnesses* also, which yet are not persons.

I observe also, that Mr. *Martin* reckons it a *Exam.* mighty advantage, that *this text has been found* ^{ch. 11.} (tho not constantly, as he says) in the *Latin Bibles* of the western churches, from the age when printing began, upwards to the eighth century; which with me, I confess, is of small account, when the inquiry is, whether ever it was in the *Greek* original, or in the *Bibles* of the *first* ages; which is not to be proved by its being now in those of the latter times.

And tho he says a text does not lose its authority because the manuscripts vary, yet the learned and judicious will allow me to tell him, that when, as he supposes, any texts are varied, or are wanting in divers manuscripts of the greatest antiquity, tho read in others, (which is not the case of our text) their authenticity as to us, becomes less certain and more doubtful in proportion to the want of evidence of their genuineness: and yet Mr. *Martin* is not so ingenuous as once to confess *this text* to be so much as *doubtful*, tho wanting in all the known *Greek* manuscripts, without any disagreement or variation; but always speaks of it as most certainly genuine, *proved by indisputable witnesses*, and by a great variety of proofs, every one of which is *conclusive*, without the assistance of the rest, and the like: in which as I believe he is almost singular, so it shall not affright me from pursuing my arguments for the contrary.

The sum of my argument against Mr. *Martin* in relation to *this text*, was in *three conclusions*:

1. That *no one* antient nor genuine *Greek* writer mentions *this text* upon any occasion whatever. To which he opposes only *two* passages of some uncertain counterfeit *Athanasius*, but relies more upon some of the *Latins*.

2. That, tho there be *so many manuscripts* which want the *verse*, there is *not one* antient *Greek manuscript* produced to countenance its admission into the *text*. To this he has opposed one manuscript at *Berlin*, of which he has made some pretences of a shuffling defence.

3. That we have no well-attested evidence, or satisfactory account, of *any one* having formerly seen any such *Greek manuscript*, tho it has been much presumed, and in general terms said, there were *some*. To this he has opposed *Robert Stephens's* manuscripts, attested, as he thinks, by *Beza*; and also *St. Jerom's* testimony, taken from his *preface*, and his *version* of the New Testament.

These *three* principal points, with which some smaller things will naturally stand or fall, I shall again consider and defend, that I may confirm the abovesaid *three conclusions*. Only I intend to leave that about the *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers to the last place, and begin with the *second*, concerning the *Berlin* manuscript, which formerly I was not fully informed of.

C H A P. I.

A true account of the Berlin Manuscript, which Mr. Martin says is reputed to be 500 years old; and his very disingenuous concealment of the evidence he had of the contrary.

I HAVE argu'd against the authority of 1 John 5. 7. that it is not found in any one antient Greek manuscript before printing, as far as yet appears to the learned world; so that it seems to have been inserted in the public impressions without any good warrant. Mr. M. on the contrary tells us, that 'tis in a manuscript at Berlin in the king's library, reputed 500 years old; and that F. le Long gives this account upon the testimony of Saubertus and Tollius; and Dr. Kettner relates the same, &c. This indeed was something to the purpose, if true. But when I look'd into F. le Long and Tollius, I found not a word of this account there; neither that the manuscript was reputed to be 500 years old, nor that the passage of St. John is in it, tho this latter proves in fact to be true: Hereupon I thought it meet to make some further inquiry about this Berlin copy.

Understanding there was a Gentleman from Berlin then at London, capable of giving a good account of this matter, I desir'd a friend, who was likely to see him, to ask him about it; which he did, and brought me for an answer, that the text in dispute was only in the margin of the Berlin Greek manuscript. Whether the question put, or the Gentleman's answer to it, was mistaken, I know not; but it seems by the following letter, here was an error, and I was

misinform'd as to the *Greek* manuscript ; it being only the noted *Latin* manuscript which wanted this verse in the text, but had it in the margin, Mr. *M.* who it appears knew the whole matter (more than he had the ingenuity to confess) confirms one part of his account by fresh advice from *Berlin* †, viz. that the *passage*, 1 John 5. 7. *is in the text of the Greek manuscript* ; but the other part, viz. the antiquity of the *manuscript*, (without which the other is nothing at all) is in a manner given up by his friend, who adds, *but we can affirm nothing certain concerning its antiquity*. I wish Mr. *M.* had let us know whether this was all that in this letter was said relating to the *manuscript*, and whether his correspondent, who could say nothing for its *antiquity*, did not at the same time acquaint him with arguments of its *novelty*, which in justice ought not to be concealed by an honest inquirer after the truth.

Immediately after the foremention'd words of the letter from *Berlin*, Mr. *M.* adds a paragraph, in which I presently thought I discerned the marks of great disingenuity, confusion, and guilt. *Whether*, says he, *this manuscript be 500 years old, or more, or less, if they will have it so, is a point to be discussed by those learned men, whose particular study has been about the ink, the parchment, the form of the characters, and such other matters, whereby they judge almost exactly of the time a manuscript was wrote in ; and yet are oft mistaken. I make myself no party in this affair ; I stand to what I quoted from F. Long : my quotation is faithful ; and whatever be determined concerning the antiquity of the copy, the passage of St. John is found in it, and stands in the body of the text ; that's enough ; even less would suffice, since the*

† Examination of Mr. Emlin's Answer, ch. xiv.

the truth I maintain has no need of the Berlin manuscript. Here is such shifting and shuffling, saying and unsaying, laying all on the back of F. Long, (who yet had not said what Mr. Martin quotes him for, as shall be shewn) such a modest willingness to be content with the truth of one half of his own assertion, that yet was utterly insignificant by itself; nay, to be content without any part of it, and to account it enough tho it were nothing at all; that I had reason to suspect here was something very unfair, if the true state of the *Berlin* copy could be fully known.

Having the happiness of an intelligent friend, who held correspondence with a very learned and eminent person in *Saxony*, I obtained the favour of him to write to his correspondent to inquire into this matter; who received (and transmitted hither in the original) the following letter from the celebrated Mr. *La Croze*, the learned library-keeper of the king of *Prussia*; in which, with the candor and ingenuity, becoming a person of integrity and true learning, he has given this full account of the manuscript under his care.

Vir Amplissime,

MALO discas ex litteris meis ea quæ nomine Cl. C—— flagitas, quàm ab eo ipso, ad quem, utpote ad virum mihi minus cognitum, litteras destinare nolui. Miror codicem nostrum, librum nullius auctoritatis, asserendæ dubiæ lectioni idoneum videri, cum jam ego compluribus viris eruditis, ipsique Reverendo Martino, manifestum fecerim, eum codicem, qui falsarii cujusdam fraude pro antiquo venditus est, & venditatur, manu recenti ex editione *Polyglotta Complutensi* fuisse descriptum. Id statim vidi cum anno MDCXVI†, Bibliothecam

P 3

† Read MDCXCVI.

‘ thecam regiam peregrinorum more, non enim
 ‘ tunc me moras *Berolini* facturum putabam, perlu-
 ‘ strarem, dixique palam *Hendreichio* τῷ μακαρίῳ;
 ‘ idque, ex quo Bibliotheca mihi credita est, can-
 ‘ dide apud omnes professus sum; neque id ig-
 ‘ norat Cl. & Reverendus *Martinus*, cui idem
 ‘ meo nomine significatum est †.

‘ Hic ergo habes compendium quæstionum
 ‘ tuarum: qui codicem editum *Complutensem*
 ‘ vidit, is vidit & manuscriptum codicem no-
 ‘ strum, ne demptis quidem mendis typogra-
 ‘ phorum, quæ scriba indoctus ita fideliter ex-
 ‘ pressit, ut omnino constet hominem illiteratum
 ‘ ab erudito aliquo nebulone ei fraudi perficiendæ
 ‘ fuisse præfectum. Et sane pro antiquo liber ille
 ‘ venditus est, immani etiam pretio, etsi mem-
 ‘ branæ recenti adhuc calx, sive creta illa inhæ-
 ‘ reat, quæ pellibus vitulinis parandis adhiberi
 ‘ solet; atramentum ubique albicans, demptis
 ‘ aliis criteriis, fraudi agnoscendæ sufficeret.

‘ Quicunque ergo ad hunc codicem provocat,
 ‘ is omnino se nihil agere norit. Certe quod ad
 ‘ me attinet, pertinax sum fidei *Nicænæ* & or-
 ‘ thodoxæ; at illi tuendæ absit ut fraudes un-
 ‘ quam adhibeam. Cæterum *versus* 7. eodem
 ‘ tenore in codice illo legitur quo 6 & 8, nec
 ‘ quicquam margini adscriptum est. Nullos a-
 ‘ lios novi testamenti codices *Græcos* manuscrip-
 ‘ tos habemus; *Latinos* vero quam plurimos,
 ‘ sed recentiores; inter quos quidam est bonæ
 ‘ notæ ex antiquissimo, ut mihi constat, de-
 ‘ scriptus, in quo *versus* octavus sextum statim
 ‘ excipit, addito tamen septimo in margine ab
 ‘ eadem manu. Hæc habui, quæ rescriberem,
 ‘ aliò

† See the letter here referr'd to in the Postscript to this
 Reply, so far as Mr. *Martin* thought proper to publish it.
Martin's Verité du texte 1 John 5. 7. p. 203.

aliò vocatus, eodem tamen momento, quo
literæ tuæ ad me delatæ sunt: nec plura in
præsenti addere licet, nisi quod me benevo-
lentia tuæ iterum, iterumque commendo

Amplissimi nominis tui studiosissimum,

Berolini, pridie Cal. Januar.

MDCCXX. quem annum
tibi faustum & felicem
precor, & rogo.

M. V. La Croze.

—It seems very strange to me, that ever our
manuscript, a book of no authority at all, should
be alledg'd in confirmation of a dubious reading, since
I have already discovered it to very many learned
men, and even to the Reverend Mr. Martin himself,
that this manuscript, tho much boasted of, and sold
by a cunning cheat for an antient book, is but a late
transcript from the Polygot of the Complutensian
edition; this I presently discerned, when as a
stranger only I viewed the King's library, before I
had any thoughts of settling at Berlin, and I then
declared the same openly to Hendreichius now de-
ceased: and ever since this library has been com-
mitted to my care, I have freely owned it upon all
occasions without reserve; and the Reverend Mr.
Martin knows it very well, who by my means has
been informed of it.

Take this therefore in short for an answer to all
your questions: He that has seen the Complutensian
printed copy, has at the same time seen our manu-
script, without excepting so much as the errors of
the printer, which the unskilful Scribe has so ex-
actly copy'd, that it plainly appears some learned
knave had committed the work to an illiterate man.

The book indeed was sold for very antient, and
also, at an huge price; and yet the parchment
is so new, that the very lime or chalk, made use of

in the dressing calve-skins, is yet upon it; and were there no other marks of fraud, the ink is enough to discover it, in that it is whitish in every part: It is therefore to no purpose to appeal to this copy. For my part I firmly hold the Nicene and orthodox faith; but God forbid I should ever go about to defend it by fraud. However in this manuscript, the 7th verse is in the text, in the same manner as the 6th and 8th are, nor is there any thing written in the margin.

We have no other Greek manuscripts of the New Testament; many Latin ones we have, but them not old; among which there is one indeed of good esteem, which appears to me to be transcribed from a very antient copy; in this the 8th verse immediately follows the 6th, and the seventh verse is added in the margin by the same hand. This is what I have to write in answer, &c. †.

Dec. 31, 1719.

I have no leave given me, nor am I restrained from making this letter public; and hope it will give no offence to the worthy author, whose critical genius, and honest regard to truth in a matter of fact, will surely merit the esteem of the learned and impartial. I have therefore set down the intire letter, according to the original, that none may suspect me of withholding any thing that might be against my cause; and shall now make a few *remarks* upon Mr. *Martin's* dishonourable conduct in this matter of the *Berlin* manuscript, which he asserted, and pretended to prove, had the *reputation of being five hundred years old.*

1. It

† This account of the *Berlin* MS. is farther confirmed in another letter from the same Mr. *La Croix* dated Aug. 16. 1733. wherein he entirely gives up the authenticity of this text, altho^o; as he intimates, his former freedom had exposed him to the censure and reflexions of some rash bigots. See that letter in the Postscript hereto.

1. It appears plainly by the abovesaid letter, and by what he has said in his *Examination of my answer*, that Mr. *Martin* had good evidence of the little or no reputation of this manuscript for antiquity; and that it was at least reasonably suspected, if not rather fully proved, to be a late transcript, since printing has been in use. How exactly do his words, *about the ink and parchment*, &c. answer to the account in Mr. *La Croze's* letter, and confirm the truth of his having been informed of the state of this copy? And yet he was not so ingenuous as to own any thing of it; only from a scrap of a letter he tells us, *we can affirm nothing certain of its antiquity*; but I judge Mr. *Martin* could have told us a great deal that had been affirmed of its *novelty*, and of its being a fraud. And ought not an impartial lover of truth to have discover'd this in a *critical dissertation*, or else not alledg'd this manuscript at all in the argument.

With what ingenuous honesty could he proceed to say, *Whether this manuscript be 500 years old, more or less, is to be discussed*, &c. As if, by the information sent him, it was as likely to be of *greater* antiquity, as of *less* than 500 years, for any thing that he had heard; or as if he had not known, that a judgment had been made of its *novelty* from the ink and parchment, and the like.

2. Mr. *Martin* has not produced any one authority or testimony that justifies his affirmation, viz. that this manuscript had the *reputation of being 500 years old*; on the contrary, tho he says, *F. Long* gives *this account* on the testimony of *Tollius* and *Saubertus*, yet *F. Long* (in the place refer'd to) says not a word of *500 years old*; much less does he ground it on the testimony of *Tollius*, for he says not a word of it neither: and I suppose

pose the same of *Saubertus*, whom I have not met with.

Examinat.
p. 102.

Indeed Mr. *Martin* had father'd the whole assertion on *F. Long*, viz. *It is said to be in a manuscript at Berlin reputed 500 years old; this account F. Long gives, &c.* but in his last tract he tells us, he contented himself with giving the antiquity of the manuscript on the testimony of *Saubertus* and *Tollius*, as recited by *F. Long*: so that we must quit him of the first half; one would hope then that the other remaining half should be well proved from *F. Long*, viz. *reputed 500 years old*; which is what Mr. *Martin* said of its antiquity, and was to prove. But tho Mr. *Martin* says, *I will stand to what I quoted from F. Long, and my quotation is faithful*, yet I think he had better confess his unfaithfulness, than to deny it.

All that *F. Long* says, is, that there is a Greek manuscript of the New Testament very old, on parchment, in great letters and without accents, which John Ravius bought for 200 Rix Dollars, and brought out of the East, and as is reported, gave it to the King's-Library at Berlin, in two vol. and then only refers to the places in *Saubertus* and *Tollius* †. Where is the account of 500 years old in this? He calls it indeed a very antient manuscript, but determines not the particular age of it, which Mr. *Martin* affirmed, and brought him for a witness of; and not very ingenuously intimates, that *F. Long* must bear all the blame if it be not so old; but when himself only, and not

† Novum Test. Græcum MS pervetustum, membranceum, literis uncialibus, & absque accentuum notis exaratum, quod ducentis imperialibus emptum ex oriente attulit, & uti fama fert, Sereniss. Electoris Brandenburgici illustri Bibliothecæ consecravit Johannes Ravius Professor Upsaliensis, 2 Vol.

Jo. Saubertus in *Proleg.* ad varias lectiones S. *Matthæi*, p. 61. de hoc Codice loquitur *Tollius* in *Epist. Itinerariis*, Ep. 11. p. 45. Berolini Bibl. Brandenburg.

F. Long, *Biblioth. S. To.* 1. Cap. 3. Sect. 4.

not F. Long said it, how could he say, *I make myself no party in this affair, I quoted it from F. Long?*

3. When he saw he could no longer justify his argument, how unfairly does he come off with this pitiful conclusion? *Whatever be determined concerning the antiquity of the copy, the passage of St. John is found in it, and in the body of the text; that's enough.* Is it so? But what is it enough for? Is it enough to prove the copy to be old, and before the art of printing, if it be but a transcript from the print? or does Mr. Martin think so meanly of mankind, that they will take the passage to have been St. John's originally, because somebody of late has written down the words? He might even as well have said, the passage is now printed, and that's enough; no matter what authority they had for it. But it must be *enough*, tho it be nothing to the purpose, because Mr. Martin could prove no more from it. From the whole of this matter I take leave to make a few inferences.

1. That Mr. Martin should not think it strange nor take it ill, if some suspicion be entertained concerning others in what they have spoken in general terms of the manuscripts made use of by them, in revising the New Testament; at least so much as to put us upon examining into the grounds they went upon; lest perhaps, thro' a cautious fear of opposing the strong and general prejudices of the age, or from some other bias, they also, like Mr. Martin, might conceal some things known to them, which they did not care to have known.

2. That he should not censure others too hardly and vehemently, if any have made some such slip, much less if it were only a mistake thro inadvertency. He should not call Robert
Stephens

Stephens a cheat and impostor, if he failed to put his marks exactly in the right place. I should be very sorry if any should give Mr. *Martin* such hard words, whom I will by no means censure as an evil man, tho I can't help thinking he has imposed on the world, and dealt unfairly in this matter, viz. in recommending the antiquity of the *Berlin* copy, while he concealed what he knew of its novelty.

3. That it still remains true what I had formerly asserted, That the passage of St. *John* is not now found in any one antient Greek manuscript yet known to the learned world; this *Berlin* manuscript being the only one Mr. *Martin* pretends to instance in, and the copies of *Stephens* and others no longer in being, as he says, or mislaid; which are the frivolous excuses he makes.

CHAP. II.

Of ROBERT STEPHENS'S *Greek manuscripts*.

Ch. 12.

TH O Mr. *Martin* can find no antient Greek manuscript in being, which has the text in dispute, yet he thinks time was when there were such manuscripts in great plenty; especially in the days of R. *Stephens*, to whose manuscripts he appeals as an invincible proof of the genuineness of this passage. To make this appear, he undertakes, 1. To shew that *Stephens* had more than seven copies of this epistle of St. *John*, and that the text under debate was in some of them entire. And, 2. That the seven copies, refer'd to by *Stephens*'s marks in his folio edition, wanted only the words ἐν τῷ ὐρανῷ, in *heaven*; and that there was no mistake in placing the Obelus, as has been long suspected. Which two points I shall

shall consider again ; tho I think what I have said in my former *answer* is sufficient to confute what Mr. *Martin* has said in reply to it.

But I must first take some notice of what he says as to the number of *Stephens's* manuscripts.

Mr. *Martin* thinks he has done a considerable thing in determining the number of *Stephens's* manuscripts to be seventeen ; pretending to correct Dr. *Mill's* error, in that under the number of *sixteen* he comprehends the *Complutensian* edition. Now tho I judge it nothing to the purpose whether there were sixteen or seventeen manuscripts, so long as there were but seven of St. *John's* epistle, yet I am not convinced that this was any error in Dr. *Mill* ; because *Stephens* himself in his preface speaks but of sixteen, and expressly says, the *Complutensian* was one of them. He marks the manuscripts in his margin, by the numeral letters in Greek, *one, two, three*, and so on, says he, *unto sixteen; ad sextum decimum usque*: and directs us by the *first* to understand the *Complutensian* *. What can be more plain ? And therefore whatever *Beza* meant by speaking of seventeen, and tho he may seem to be a better judge in the case than Dr. *Mill*, yet I think *Stephens* himself a better judge than either of them, who mentions no more than *sixteen* ; and which is more still, the work itself shews it, since Mr. *Martin* pretends not to find any *seventeenth* number once referr'd to throughout the whole ; which is a demonstration that *Stephens* made use of but *sixteen* manuscripts. I thought in one place Dr. *Mill* had allow'd *sixteen* besides the *Complutensian* ; but I perceive on a more strict review of his words, that he did

* *Ut primo, Complutensiam editionem intelligas, secundo, &c.*

did not. Let us now examine the *two* main points about these manuscripts.

1. Whether more than *seven* had St. John's epistle?

2. Whether *Stephens's* marks, as to *them*, were right?

1. Mr. *Martin* has not proved that *Stephens* in all his sixteen manuscripts had more than seven copies of St. John's epistle; or that Dr. *Mill* and Dr. *Roger* of *Bourges*, &c. were in a mistake in so judging; on the contrary, Mr. *Martin's* way of reasoning about it is weak and ridiculous; *their's* solid and just who argue against him. To shew this, we must take a view of both.

Mr. *Martin's* pretended proof of more than seven manuscripts, is grounded on his own observations, which he expresses thus: 'The seven canonical epistles being ordinarily joined in one volume with the epistles of St. Paul; it follows from thence that *R. Stephens* had as many copies of the seven canonical epistles as of the other. Now I have found fourteen manuscripts of St. Paul's epistles marked in the margins, whence I concluded there were so many of the seven epistles.' And he adds, 'we have a right to presume nothing is wanting to a volume, till it be made appear that some part of it is so.'

But if Mr. *Martin* had duly considered the state of the manuscripts of the New Testament, as they are related in *F. Long's Bibliotheca Sacra*, and Dr. *Mill's Prolegomena*, he would have known that there is such a great variety and diversity in the volumes of manuscripts, that there is no room for determining what they *ordinarily* contain; or for concluding from one part of the New Testament being in a manuscript, how many other parts are connected with it. Sometimes
in

in one manuscript, all the four Gospels are ; sometimes but one, or two, or three of them ; and sometimes the *Acts* ; and of what Mr. *Martin* calls the second volume, sometimes the *Acts* may be with only the seven catholic epistles, and not St. *Paul's* ; sometimes St. *Paul's*, and none of the seven, which made often a third volume, nay sometimes two or three of St. *Paul's* alone. So that the foundation of Mr. *Martin's* argument is a weak and childish fancy, viz. That the manuscripts are ordinarily made up in complete volumes, like our printed books, where the whole impression being uniform, one may indeed presume nothing is wanting till it be made appear : but to talk so of manuscripts, which are oft but small scatter'd parts, written at the pleasure and choice of various and particular persons, is very absurd.

Mr. *Martin* himself can discern this at another time : when Dr. *Bentley's* manuscripts were objected to him, he says, and very properly, *We don't know how many manuscripts Dr. Bentley may have of St. John's epistle.* He surmises what is reasonable, and I doubt not very true in fact, that some of those manuscripts are but of one part, and others of other parts : the like I say of *Stephens's* manuscripts, and therefore I can't but pity his rashness and confidence in daring to say, *If then there were eleven manuscript copies of St. Paul's fourteen epistles, there were so many of the canonical epistles, for all the one and twenty were bound together.* This is a very absolute and peremptory assertion of what Mr. *Martin* cannot prove to be true, and what the most capable judges will think to be very false. He is angry with me for using often the words *perhaps*, and *possibly*, and the like, (which yet I shall not forbear in reasoning about distant facts or words

Examinat.
ch. 3.

Dissertat.
ch. ix.

words not fully known) but if he had used some such softning word here and in many other parts of his writings, he need not have been ashamed of his modesty, for his argument would very well bear it.

P. 207. Mr. *Martin's* other observation from the copy mark'd *id*, is sufficiently refuted by what I shewed from Dr. *Mill's* particular account of that copy in my former answer, which I suppose is accepted. These are the observations by which, if we believe himself, *he has undeniably proved that Stephens's manuscripts of St. John's epistle were not reduced to the number of seven.* But if this be his undeniable proof, we need not be much moved with the highest commendations he oft gives of his own arguments.

I am next to represent the method which is used on the contrary side, in order to shew that *Stephens's* manuscripts of *St. John's epistle* were no more than *seven*; which Mr. *Martin* dislikes. Since *Stephens* hath not given an account how much each manuscript contained of the New Testament, (of which Dr. *Mill* complains) the learned have thought this the only way of finding it out, viz. by observing how far he has made use of each manuscript in noting the various Readings; for which he had so many occasions, that tho they did not offer in every chapter, or in such a small epistle as the 2d or 3d epistle of *St. John*, (which Mr. *Martin* remarks) yet in a much larger compass there could not but be some various readings in them, to be taken notice of by one that carefully collated the manuscripts. If then *Stephens*, who had made frequent references to the other manuscripts in the other parts of the New Testament, has never once referred to any but the *seven*, throughout the whole epistles of *St. John*, nor throughout all the
seven

seven *Catholic* epistles, (which indeed generally went together) is it not rationally concluded, he had no other manuscripts of *them* but these *seven* before him? How strange were it to suppose there should not be any sort of different reading in all that compass!

We find one single chapter of St. *Peter's* 2d ^{Proleg.} epistle was (according to Dr. *Mill's* relation of N^o 1174, it) annexed to a manuscript of the Gospels, 1175, mark'd id; and this indeed is refer'd to by *Stephens* in that chapter. 1176. Could there then be other manuscripts of all the seven epistles, and yet never be taken notice of? Mr. *Martin* has not observed to us any mark of any other but the *seven* manuscripts, save that on 2 *Pet.* 1. 4. which I have been speaking of. Let it be judged then if this be not the most equal and rational process; tho I do not say it was not possible in *Stephens* to have manuscripts, and not make use of them till he came just to 1 *John* 5. 7. yet I think no man will ever presume it, if Mr. *Martin* does not.

Nay, if I mistake not, Mr. *Martin* himself has owned this way of reasoning to be just; for however he flights it in others when against his cause, yet himself has naturally gone into it before he was aware, in his *Dissertation*. For Chap. 9. thus he proves some of *Stephens's* manuscripts to have been not complete ones of the whole New Testament: *The reason*, says he, *why I say Stephens had some copies thus imperfect, is, that I find in the Tome of the gospels mention made of certain manuscripts that no where occur in the epistles, as are the third, the sixth, and eighth; and so I find some in the epistles that are no where seen in the gospels.* And again, *As for the second volume, (i. e. the latter part of the New Testament, or the epistolary code) I have observed eleven manuscript copies, whereof nine had also the*

first volume, but the two others, viz. 11 and 15, must have belonged to a defective book. Is not this the very method which in his Examination he condemns?

If because the manuscripts mentioned in the Gospels are not mentioned in the epistles, we may, nay *must* conclude, that those manuscripts did not contain the epistles, (tho ordinarily they went together, for he says, *nine* of them had both;) then surely, where the manuscripts mentioned in St. Paul's epistles never occur in all the seven catholic epistles, we may conclude they belong'd to *defective books*, which had not those seven epistles in them: for it was common to have St. Paul's epistles separate from the others. So that upon the whole, I think hitherto we have much stronger proof of Stephens's having but seven manuscripts of St. John's epistles, than Mr. Martin's pretended undeniable proofs of his having more.

But he insists on further proof from the testimony of Beza, who in his first note on this verse says, *Erasmus read it in the manuscript of England; the Complutenſian editors read it also; and we read it in some manuscripts of our friend R. Stephens; tho these do not agree in all the words, &c.* And afterwards, in another note upon the words, *in heaven*, he says, *these words were wanting in seven manuscripts: whence Mr. Martin infers, that Stephens had more than seven manuscripts of this epistle; seven wherein those two words were not, and some others in which the verse was entire as inserted in the text; and that Beza makes a manifest distinction between the manuscripts of the one and of the other, or between the some manuscripts and the seven.*

To this I answer, that the words of Beza do not at all imply that the seven manuscripts in the
second

second note, were not among the *nonnullis*, or the *some* mention'd in the first; for he does not say, in *septem aliis codicibus*, in seven other manuscripts: and 'tis absurd to imagine, when he says in one *note*, this is wanting in *two*; and in the next note, this is wanting in *three* or in *four* manuscripts; that therefore all these are different manuscripts: how many hundred manuscripts must we have at this rate? No, the same manuscripts are again oft produced under several heads; and I doubt not but it was so here, and that the *seven* which wanted the words, in *heaven*, were of the *some* which he thought had the *verse*; because according to *Stephens's marks*, they would appear to have it all but *these* words.

'Tis evident that *Beza* could not in his way of reckoning, but account these *seven* manuscripts to be among those that had the *verse* in gross, tho they wanted *those* words, (unless he knew also they wanted more than the words, in *heaven*, which *Mr. Martin* will not yield) because he reckons the *Complutensian* and the *British* copies among them, which yet had not the *entire* words as inserted in *Stephens's text*; and he owns that they disagreed in several particulars: And indeed in one there is a difference, judged to be of more importance than the omission of the words, in *heaven*, amounts to: so that here was no more reason for distinguishing the *seven* manuscripts from those which had the *verse* in gross, than for distinguishing the others which had their different readings too, but yet are said by him to have the *verse*. These then were intended in *Beza's nonnullis*, or *some* manuscripts, if he spake rationally and consistently; but if he talked confusedly and obscurely, (which I must own I suspect he did) then 'tis in vain to guess at his meaning, or to argue from it.

That *Beza* writes confusedly and obscurely, as a man uncertain, and that had not fully inquired into the manuscripts, as ought to be done in so critical and important a case, (unless he had a mind to leave it in the dark) seems to me very plain; else why did he in so nice a matter, and so much contested, only say in general, *this verse, tho wanting in such and such, &c. is yet in some of Stephens's manuscripts?* Why did he not tell the world in which manuscripts it was, at least in how many of them; as in the next note, and in the foregoing notes, he did? sometimes he mentions *two*, sometimes *three*, and *seven*, &c. Why were we in this extraordinary subject to be put off with a loose and careless indefinite *some*? I can't but suspect, that having *Stephens's* copy before him, where *he* had set down *seven* in the margin, *Beza* could easily say *seven* too in his notes; but in this place where there was no such guide, he only ventures to say 'tis in some, since it was in the text of *Stephens*.

Ch. 12.
at the end.

That *Beza* took little care to make any search into the manuscripts himself, I had noted from *Dr. Mill*; so that *Mr. Martin* need not ask, *Where did I find this?* And whereas I had said *Beza* was furnished with *Henry Stephens's* (Son of *Robert*) collection of the various readings of *more copies* (*Dr. Mill* says *ten*) added to those of his father; by which means, I judge, he was eased of his own laborious search: *Mr. Martin* breaks out into these angry and censorious words, 'Tis a disagreeable thing to have to do with men, who bazard every thing, and fear not what they say. But wherein have I been so regardless of truth as this censure represents me? *Beza*, says he, received not this valuable copy from *H. Stephens*, till after the death of *Robert* his father, who

lived three years after himself had printed the New Testament and Annotations of Beza, published Anno 1556.

But as I never said *Beza* received this copy from *Henry Stephens*, so I doubt *Mr. Martin* has spoken at all hazards, in saying positively that *Beza* never received this copy of *H. Stephens* till after the death of *Robert* his father. I demand his evidence for this: for *Dr. Mill*, who was a considerate and wary man, tells us, that it was *Robert Stephens* who gave *Beza* this collection of his son's, and I think I shall not hazard any thing if I say, that he gave it in his life-time. And till *Mr. Martin* brings his vouchers for what he so earnestly and positively asserts, I shall take leave to credit *Dr. Mill* rather than him; and the more, because I find *Beza* himself says, that he had a copy of various readings (which I take to be the same) in *Robert Stephens*'s time, even before the edition in 1556. In the preface to which, speaking of what helps he had in this work, he says, *Moreover I had a copy from my friend Stephens's library, which had been carefully compared with about twenty-five manuscripts, and almost all the printed editions: which one thing has eased me of a great deal of trouble, since I could here sometimes see the conjectures of interpreters confirmed by some manuscripts**. So that instead of his saying, *I fear'd not*, it may perhaps be thought, that *Mr. Martin* here cared not what he said.

In short, if *Beza's nonnullis*, or some manuscripts, were only the same with his seven which

Q 3

wanted

* Ad hæc omnia accessit exemplar ex *Stephani* nostri bibliotheca, cum viginti quinque plus minus MSS. Codicibus, & omnibus pene impressis, diligentissime collatum. Quæ res una, præ cæteris, magnopere me sublevavit, quum interdum viderem, quæ alioqui sola interpretum conjectura nitebantur, alicujus codicis autoritate confirmata.

wanted the words, *in heaven*, then he mentions no more than *seven*; and so it proves not Mr. *Martin's* point, *viz.* that *Stephens* had more than seven manuscripts of *St. John's* epistles: but if he meant some *others* besides, tho not excluding the seven, then he should have said, that the *verse* was in *all Stephens's* manuscripts, since it was both in the seven, (as is supposed by him) and in the others also; unless Mr. *Martin* will say, as he seems to do, that of those *others*, some had, and some wanted the whole *verse*. Of which I shall make some use hereafter, in relation to *Stephens's* care and accuracy in placing and correcting his marks of reference; upon which alone Mr. *Martin* depends for making good his authority for this *verse*, from those *seven* manuscripts; to the consideration of which I now pass, and add,

Secondly, That Mr. *Martin* has not clear'd *Stephens* from a mistake in his marks, referring to the seven copies, which alone he had, of *St. John's* epistle.

Whatever becomes of the rest of *Stephens's* manuscripts, yet, if those *seven*, which are noted in his margin, did want only the words *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, *in heaven*, it will follow, I grant, that all the rest of the *verse* was in those very copies. But tho *Stephens's* marks are placed so as to signify that only those *two* words are wanting, yet it will not be granted that this is *decisive* for the authority of *this text*, or for proving that it was in those *manuscripts*, if there be good reason to suspect that one of *Stephens's* marks was placed wrong; and that instead of being set after the words, *in heaven*, it should have been set after the words, *in earth*, in the next *verse*.

Many learned men, who could be glad to secure the authority of *this text*, have greatly doubted, that there is a mistake in *Stephens* in this matter.

matter. Near 150 years ago, the Divines of the university of *Louvain* made an exception upon this article: Mr. *Martin* can't think but they had some weighty reason for making this scruple; probably it was because they had never seen or heard of any such copy which wanted those two words, *in heaven*, and no more; and then it would seem strange that *Stephens* had so many of them as *seven*: this stagger'd those divines almost at the beginning, and the stumbling-block remains unremoved to this day. For,

That which strengthens the objection against *Stephens's* mark, is, that upon inquiry into the *French king's* library, where *Stephens* had some of his manuscripts, there is no such manuscript found there, nor elsewhere that I ever heard of, which wanted *those* words, and no more; and this is what I ask, to have one manuscript in proof of it; and it is not *ridiculous*, but reasonable, for Mr. *Martin* grants the way to determine this point of the *Obelus*, would be by the manuscripts themselves; but he says, this is impracticable, because, as he pretends, *the manu-* Examir.
scripts are no longer in being. ch. xiii. But I know not what warrant he or any have for saying so, save that they can find none which answers to their expectation in this affair. Manuscripts, I mean antient ones, have been of greater esteem and value, and so more worthy of careful preservation, from *Stephens's* time than they were before; and as they are of no value but to him that preserves them, so it is not likely very many of them should be destroy'd, that had once been taken notice of, and highly prized: and 'tis strange if not so much as *one* out of *seven* should escape, to tell us there had been such a copy.

What way then will Mr. *Martin* take to assure us that *Stephens* has been exact and just, and that

those strong suspicions are all groundless? Truly only this, that *Stephens* has not corrected himself as he ought, and as he thinks he would, if he had set his marks wrong: he tells us, as he was *exact and judicious*, he ought to have given an advertisement of so considerable a fault as this, by way of emendation, which he has not done; and that *Beza's* annotations were printed by *Stephens* himself; that it was a *nice and curious* matter, to see in what manner *Beza* had spoken of this passage concerning the Trinity in the God-head, which had raised great contests: That all this deserved that he should see what use *Beza* had made of his manuscripts, on a text of this importance; And then infers, *Who can doubt after this, that if Beza had advanced a falsehood in asserting that he read the verse in Stephens's manuscripts, that learned printer would not have discerned it, or that he would have printed it?* concluding, that if *Stephens* had not such manuscripts, in which the text was found, he was an impostor, an infamous fellow, and deserv'd the utmost contempt.

But what is there in all this more than the bare telling us what *Stephens* ought to have done? And so he ought in all the other parts of his work; but yet he has not by his care and faithfulness either prevented or corrected all considerable faults; and therefore this alone is no sufficient satisfaction that there is no fault in the matter before us, where we have such grounds to suspect it.

I am far from detracting from the praise and esteem of *R. Stephens* as a critic, and a curious printer; nor do I think him at so little a distance from the character of an infamous fellow, worthy of utmost contempt, that nothing stands between him and it, but only the slender supposition of his having set his marks exactly right here. 'Tis
Mr.

Mr. Martin who uses him thus cruelly, forgetting how easily men run into little arts of disguise and concealment about manuscripts.

But still I cannot rely on Stephens's care and faithfulness, with such a confidence as Mr. Martin requires, nor yet clear him from all faults, either in other texts, or in this itself. How Beza and he managed it, I know not, nor what their intention was; but I see plainly they, with Mr. Martin, have left the business in uncertainty and inconsistency, as I will shew anon.

That Stephens made many omissions, is so apparent, that Dr. Mill found above 700 of them in one article, viz. in comparing the Complutensian edition, in which he found so many different readings not taken notice of by him. And so Proleg. N^o far was he from unerring exactness, that he sometimes put into the text what he had no sufficient authority for. I will give one instance, which I observed without much search, in Rev. i. 11, where the words, *I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last*, are put into Stephens's text, and his margin notes them to be wanting only in two manuscripts α and ϵ ; whereas Beza on the place tells us, *these words are not in the Complutensian edition, nor in any other of Stephens's manuscripts* *. Here then let me ask Mr. Martin the same questions which he asks in relation to the text of St. John, Whence came it there? or where did Stephens meet with it to give it that place, if it was in none of his manuscripts? And why did he mark only two copies as wanting the words? Why did he not say, *ἐν πᾶσι*, or in all, as Mr. Martin pretends he would, if he saw them not in any manuscripts? And why did he not give an advertisement of this fault, &c?

Will

* Neque extant in Complut. edit. neque in alio quodam vetusto codice ex nostris.

Will Mr. *Martin* say he was an infamous fellow for inserting these words without *manuscripts*? I hope he will not treat him in this cruel manner. Now apply but all this to his insertion of the passage of St. *John*, and his misplacing the marks, and all Mr. *Martin's* long flourishes upon the exactness and faithfulness of that learned printer will do him little service. What tho he said in his preface, that he put nothing into the text, *nullam omnino literam*, not a letter, but upon the authority of the most and best *manuscripts*? We see 'twas not so in fact; and therefore it is but empty *barangue* to run out into an *encomium* of *Stephens's* care and concern, and his duty in the case, when we are enquiring what he has, not what he should have done. Mr. *Martin* says, He had not the villany to forge a text which had not been in his own *manuscripts*; nor do I say any thing of his villany: but he has put in some text which *Beza* (Mr. *Martin's* own evidence) says was not in his own *manuscripts*; and why should he not be as likely to do it in St. *John's* Epistle, where he might be under more fear of offending others, and where he had the *Complutensian* edition to countenance the passage, as in St. *John's* Revelation, where he had not that precedent?

It may perhaps be said, that *Beza* however has corrected this fault of *Stephens's*; true, he did say what is contrary to *Stephens's* account, but does not take notice of *Stephens's* fault in the matter. And I conceive also that I see the like in *Beza's* notes on the passage in St. *John's* Epistle, how that tho he finds not fault with his friend *Stephens's* marks, yet he has said something which is inconsistent with him, and that shews there was something wrong in his marks; for he only says this verse was read in *nonnullis*, in some of *Stephens's* *manuscripts*, as well as in the *Complutensian*; by which it appears, that it was not in all

all of them, (for he would not have concealed that) and so Mr. Martin, I think, takes it; for he says, *We cannot determine in how many of them the verse was, only 'twas in some of them.* And in his *Examination*, &c. he says, *That at least* Ch. xij. *there were two wherein it was perfect, for the expression in some, which Beza uses, must be understood of two at least; so that there were at least nine in which the verse was found, besides the Complutensian copy.*

Now, if Beza spake exactly upon his own accurate search, as Mr. Martin thinks, and not at adventures, this plainly contradicts Stephens, who represents the verse to be in all his manuscripts, but without the words, *in heaven*, in seven of them; for he does not mark one in the margin as wanting the whole. And so the *Louvain Divines* understood it, that all Stephens's copies had the verse †. And if Mr. Martin will have it, that he had fourteen manuscripts, and we should suppose, by his reasoning from Beza, that nine had the verse, then I ask, What had Stephens done with the rest? Where is there any mark or note shewing us those other *some*, which wanted the whole verse? Ought not that to have been marked, if he dealt so carefully and honestly in a matter so curious and important, and that had raised great contests? But where is this advertised, or corrected by him? And yet Beza tacitly, perhaps unawares, discovers it; and in his notes on the 8th verse, seems not to judge the authority certain and undeniable for our 7th verse, by observing that the words, *on earth*, tho not in all copies, should yet be kept, *nisi*, says he, *expungatur proxime antecedens versus.* But I think if all the manuscripts confirmed so strongly that verse, he need not have made such an exception, viz. *unless the preceding verse be put out.*

It

† Inter omnes Stephani ne unus est qui diffideat.

It seems plain then that *Stephens* has not done right to the manuscripts, in not marking what wanted the verse; and *Beza*, if he saw it, and had a mind to be open in such an important point, could have set the matter in a clear light by mentioning what, or how many manuscripts had it, and not have left us in the dark still, by an uncertain *nonnullis*, or *some* of them.

If Mr. *Martin* to avoid the argument shall retreat, and say, that all *Stephens's* manuscripts had the verse in gross, he must remember, that it is what *Beza* would not pretend to say; and what also carries in it very absurd suppositions, viz. 1. That he should have thirteen or fourteen manuscripts all agreeing in having the verse. *Cajetan* speaks of but *some*; *Erasmus* could find none; *Caryophilus* none, and *F. Simon* none: But *Stephens* could find *none other*, it seems! What not one that wanted it? What strange luck had he? How different from all other inquirers after the antient manuscripts? 2. And what is further strange, is, that all these are lost: What, fourteen, or eleven, or nine manuscripts, be it which it will, all in a cluster, and not one to be found since! Did *Stephens*, think we, burn them when he had done? or had no body any value for such a manuscript to spare and to preserve it, as they did to many others? How much more easy is it to think *Stephens* might make a silent slip, and drop his *semicircle* too short, than to admit so many absurdities all at once*?

And as for his edition with *Beza's* annotations, it was done hastily: the author was weary, and

* But notwithstanding all Mr. *Martin's* fine suppositions and confident assertions, they appear plainly to be false in fact, from an actual search made into *Stephens's* manuscripts by *F. le Long*; an account whereof he sent to Mr. *Martin*. See *F. le Long's* Letter in the postscript to this Reply.

and the printer in haste; and since, in his *advertisement* at the end, he bespeaks favour and pardon of his omissions or neglects upon that account, I think we ought to accept his excuse, *Hæc tantæ festinationi condona.*

Nor is it unworthy of our consideration, that *Beza's* annotations were printed by *Stephens* at *Geneva*, at a time and place flaming with bitter zeal and prejudice against all *Antitrinitarians*, where *Servetus* had been cruelly burnt at the Stake but three years before, at the instigation of *Calvin*; and *Beza* was so full of it, that in these very annotations, he could not forbear justifying the fact; having mentioned *Servetus's* standing in his opinions even to death, on 2 *Pet.* 1. 4. he adds an ironical scoff, not much less cruel than his death itself *, *yet, good man, some think he had great wrong done him.* Is it any great wonder then if they durst not, or would not cast out such a text, that was thought a principal support of the orthodox faith, and had been in their *Latin* Bibles, and in some impressions of the *Greek*? No doubt it was more safe to say little, and to let it pass with a silent omission; and perhaps we may say (as *Mr. Martin* says of him, in relation to his inserting the words *ἐν τῷ ὐρανῷ*, *in heaven*, tho against the authority of all, at least of most of his manuscripts) *discerning that this could be no other than an omission, he gave them a place in his text.*

Upon the whole of this subject of the manuscripts, I cannot but make this reflexion. What a strange slippery text do some make this to be? who suppose that at first it was left out generally in the most early transcripts of *St. John's* epistle, (which

* *Sunt tamen qui magnam bono viro injuriam putant factam.*

(which they can't well deny from its being wanting in the antient versions, and from the silence of the primitive writers;) that afterwards it was found in *Africa*, or somewhere else; and was brought back again into the copies as a choice treasure; but now when we come to look for it, it is gone again, and none knows how long; so that both at *first* and at *last* 'tis wanting, as if no care nor caution were sufficient to hold it fast in the Bible.

When Mr. *Martin* can give us the like instance of any other verse in the New Testament thus managed, we shall be less ashamed to give credit to this.

As for the rest of the *Greek* manuscripts, which others, besides *Stephens*, are presumed to have seen, I see nothing more that need be said of them, but refer my reader to what I have offered in my former answer.

F. *Amelot's* evidence, that he found it in the most antient manuscripts in the Vatican library; has been fully overthrown in my *Answer*, p. 202. The *Complutensian* editors had no manuscript for the text where it was presumed: *Erasmus* put it into his 3d edition against his judgment, for fear of reproach: *Cajetan* says only, 'tis found but in some; (just as F. *Simon* once said, when he knew of none :) And who at that time could have presum'd less? *Laur. Valla* is silent, and says nothing; which silence Mr. *Martin* takes for good authority, that it was in all his seven manuscripts; and yet he has not proved he had so many as *three*, of St. *John's* epistle: For he only shews he had seven of the *Gospels*; which might be, and yet not one of them of *that* epistle. Nor is it any wonder that *Valla* should hold his peace, if he found *this verse* wanting in the *Greek*; when Mr. *Martin* tells us, that he

he durst not give his book the true title of *The* ^{Examin.} *Latin version compared with the Greek*, since it ^{ch. x.} *would have startled his readers, and might have brought him into trouble, by reason of the extreme affection, which was shewn towards the Latin version; and that some made him guilty of a kind of sacrilege, for having attempted to alter the Latin version.* What then had become of *Valla*, if he had thrown out this text? And yet his silence must be a convincing proof that he found it! Truly Mr. *Martin* has quite spoiled his evidence by talking too much about him.

So that I think I might justly say, there is no evidence of one *antient Greek* manuscript yet known to the world, which warrants *this text*; which yet is very different from saying absolutely, *that there is not so much as one which has it*, which Mr. *Martin* unjustly affirms of me, and adds, *that I repeat it an hundred times.* I may urge ^{Examin.} him indeed with the omission of it *in all*, as ^{ch. x. at} what I think probable, but I did not assert that ^{the begin-} *'tis not in any manuscript in the world.* ^{ning.}

CHAP. III.

Of St. Jerom's Preface and Bible.

FOrasmuch as St. *Jerom* reformed the *Latin* version by the best *Greek* manuscripts in his time, 'tis reasonable to conclude that *his New Testament* should be very agreeable to the original *Greek*. His testimony therefore, who search'd into the primitive manuscripts, must needs be of greatest weight to determine the genuineness of this passage of St. *John*. But how shall we know what St. *Jerom* thought of this matter? It must be either from his *writings*, by shewing that he quoted *this text*; or from the most *an-*
tient

tient copies of his *Bible* itself: but neither of these give any countenance to the text.

Crit. Hist.
of Vers.
cb. ix.

Examinat.
cb. i.

Dissertat.
b. xii.

There is no pretence for it from any of *Jerom's* undoubted writings, where he had very great occasion for such a text: All that is pretended is from an uncertain *preface* to the seven epistles, which has been in some *Latin* Bibles and not in others; and in the former, sometimes it was attributed to *Jerom*, and sometimes without any author named. The learned in our age, are pretty generally agreed that this was not *Jerom's*, even as many other *prefaces* have been attributed to him in the manuscripts, which apparently belong not to him, as *F. Simon* has observed. *Du Pin*, *Martianus*, *Dr. Mill*, &c. have given it up. But *Mr. Martin*, who being secure in nothing lays hold of every thing, maintains it to be genuine; and has the vanity to say, he has proved the fact, and maintained it against the strongest objections that were ever made to it. And yet I think he has not said one word in proof of it, but that it has bore *St. Jerom's* name, and passed under that title a long time; when yet himself can tell us, when 'tis in favour of his own cause, that a thousand examples may be given of titles prefix'd to the works of the antients afterwards by others, who finding a treatise without a title, judg'd it convenient to make one; so it might be here.

Nor has *Mr. Martin* maintained it against all objections; he has said something indeed to shew that possibly it might be *St. Jerom's* notwithstanding some of the objections; viz. notwithstanding it be not in his own catalogue of *prefaces*; notwithstanding it be often without his name; notwithstanding the use of the word *canonical* epistles, instead of *catholic*; and notwithstanding *Bede* took no notice of this *preface*,

face, nor yet of the *text* which it speaks of, tho he commented on St. *John's* epistles. But what does all this amount to? It does not shew it to be so much as probable and likely; only that 'tis possible, while 'tis on many accounts very improbable, and more than possible to be false.

But he has not answered the arguments I insisted on, which only are what I need defend; and yet he is so trifling and vain as to say, that if I defend not the arguments on my side of the question, I fairly own myself defeated. Mr. Martin may be one of those writers, if he will, who are sure to defend every thing said by any one on his side of the question; but I beg leave to defend what I myself judge to be valid and convincing. I had said, that St. *Ferom*, in this preface, appears to insinuate that all the *Greek* copies had this *text*, which from the total silence of the *Greek* Fathers as to this text, must be false: Mr. Martin denies any such insinuation to be in the complaint of *unfaithful translators who had departed from the truth*. But why then should he complain only of the *translators*, as the cause of all this mischief? If there were the same corruption in the *Greek* copies; then the translators might have been very faithful still, and not the authors of this corruption, as he makes them to be; and thereby he clearly insinuates, that he knew not of any *Greek* copies, but what had those words, omitted by the translators.

I had also argued, that if St. *Ferom* had not only look'd on this text as a *principal support of the Christian faith, by which the one substance of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is confirmed*, but also on himself as the *restorer* and preserver of it, when it had been lost among the *Latin*

versions; it were a most strange thing that he should never mention this text in all his genuine writings, which he had so many occasions for, and which wanted to be inculcated and revived, because left out in the *Latin* translations. Surely he would soon have loudly alarm'd the world with this danger, or this treachery, which he had espied: But not one word is there of such a text in all his voluminous works.

In answer to this Mr. *Martin* says, *It does not follow that, because an antient writer has not quoted this text in a discourse wherein it was natural to quote it, and which since has been quoted by others, the writer did not look upon it as really St. John's, and gives an instance in Vigilins to this purpose, who among his many proper occasions for this text does but sometimes mention it. But he should have read with more attention, and then he had found that I argued not barely from St. Jerom's silence, tho that were a strong presumption, but from his sense of the importance of this text, and his being the restorer of it, when it was in danger of being lost, and had been left out of the Latin versions by unfaithful translators, as the preface pretends: Would such a man as St. Jerom have always forgotten to produce and to revive this text? This was a peculiar case, to which no other instance comes up.*

And tho *Jerom* have no particular treatise against the *Arians*, yet frequently he falls upon them in his epistles and commentaries: Methinks he that so oft produces the words, *I and the Father are one*; and, *Baptize all nations in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*, to prove the Trinity; and who could find that mystery so often in *Ezekiel's* prophecy, would as well have produced this text for it, if he had

as much known of it as of the others; since it must needs have been *more* upon his thoughts than others, if he had accounted it the *chief support* of that doctrine, and had been so offended with others for omitting it. I think this is very fair reasoning, and shews that the *preface* is no ways agreeable to St. *Jerom*, especially when there is no proof offer'd that it was his, but only that it has been thought so; and I am willing others should judge which of these is the strongest and most rational presumption.

I have yet more to add to confirm the argument from St. *Jerom*'s silence; and that is, that St. *Austin* had not *this text*; which will go far to prove that it was not in St. *Jerom*'s Bible, or version of the New Testament; and then 'tis certain the *preface* could not be St. *Jerom*'s.

St. *Augustin* has given us a great part of the Scripture in his numerous writings; he has written a great deal expressly of the *Trinity*, and against the *Arians*; and had the greatest occasion of any man for *this text*, in order to prove the unity of the three persons, as I have shewn in my *Answer* to Mr. *Martin*. He says his adversary could not find an instance in the Scriptures, where it was ever said of different substances, *They are one*. Himself shews 'tis said so of such as were of one substance, as *John* 10. 30. and of *Paul* and *Apollos*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 8. Now how apposite had *our text* been for this illustration, had he known of it? Nay more, supposing it might be argued from the next verse, that *the Water, Blood, and Spirit*, are said to be *one*, which are different substances, he flees to the common mystical sense of these words, as signifying Father, Son, and Spirit, which he thought made for him, as being of one substance; *Of whom*, says he, *it might most truly be said, There are three*

that bear witness, and these three are one; by the Spirit meaning the Father; by the Blood, the Son; by the Water, the Holy Spirit †. To what purpose should he make use of this forced uncertain interpretation of the words, (which he a little after allows to be expounded by others, if they think fit, after another manner) if he had the express words of our text before him? Why does he say, *potuit dici, It might be said of the Father, Son, and Spirit, these three are one*, if actually it had been said so directly in this very place? Would any man in his senses argue thus? 'Tis clear as the day, he knew not *this text* which does say it, when he only brings the next verse which might say it.

Canon of
N. T. p.
78.

Indeed this is so very clear, that Mr. Du Pin says peremptorily, *St. Augustin knew nothing of this passage, else he had not failed to quote it. Beza himself grants, in his notes on the verse, that Austin did not read it in the text. None, I believe, but Mr. Martin will pretend the contrary; and he himself faints under the difficulty of it, by saying, For my part, I maintain this passage either was in St. Augustin's Bible, or in case it was wanting, his Bible was defective. 'Tis very true! His Bible then had this defect; which is what at present I aim at.*

Dissertat.
eb. vi.

From hence I infer, that St. Jerom's Bible had the same defect also as to this verse; because they two had such free intercourse by letters in relation to the Bible, and St. Augustin knew so well what was in St. Jerom's version, that 'tis just to suppose, if there had been a difference in so important an article, as *this text* being in one Bible and wanting in the other, we should have heard of it from them,

† L. 3. cont. *Maxim.* De quibus verissime dici potuit, tres sunt testes, & tres unum sunt. — Si quo alio modo, &c.

them, among many other matters of that kind, of smaller moment. *Jerom* had many opposers, who censured his performance, and accused him of altering the Scriptures against the authority of the antients; and *St. Austin* himself for some time found fault with his *Old Testament*; but yet in *his* Epistle to him, he highly commended his version of the New Testament in these words, *We heartily thank God for your translation of the Gospel, because there is nothing in it which offends us when we compare it with the* * *Greek*. It seems then that *St. Augustin* compared it with the *Greek*, and found it to agree: but neither from the *Greek* manuscripts, nor from *St. Jerom's* emendation of the *New Testament*, (as *St. Jerom* in the next Epistle, in answer to him, calls that which *Augustin* named the translation of the Gospel) did he learn this text in *St. John*; nor does he object any thing from the *Italic* version about it; tho, I suppose, he had as good a right to have the *common Bible*, which *Mr. Martin* talks of, as others after him.

I may carry this matter yet further. It appears that *St. Augustin* was well acquainted with *St. Cyprian's* works, who had been eminent in a neighbouring *See*, and whose writings he oft refers to; and tho he had very probably read, at least heard of *his* testimony from *St. John* concerning the Trinity, yet had he not gathered from thence, that there were any such words in *St. John* as these, *There are three that bear witness, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit*, any otherwise than as it might be said so, by a mystical interpretation of the other three witnesses in the 8th verse, which, *Facundus* expressly tells

R 3

us,

* *Aug. Hieronymo* epist. x. ed *Basil.* MDLVI. Quia pene in omnibus nulla offensio est, cum Scripturam *Græcam* contulerimus.

us, was also St. Cyprian's meaning in that famous testimony.

Examinat.
ch. viii.

Which, by the way, may satisfy us, that if the *African* Bishops had this *text* in their Bibles after St. *Augustin's* time, yet it was not in the *Italic* version used by him, who was more eminent and inquisitive than any of *them*; which may check Mr. *Martin's* confident conclusion *with regard to the Italic version, That all the monuments of this antient translation, we have extant in the writings of the Fathers, agree in giving us this passage.* For we see St. *Austin* did not agree in it; nor consequently did St. *Jerom's* Bible, if that and St. *Augustin's* were so much alike. And then I hope the *preface* pretended for such could not be St. *Jerom's*; nor any proof that *this verse* was in his Bible.

There is but one thing more I need say upon this head, and that is concerning the very learned Dr. *Bentley's* manuscripts, of a *thousand* years old or upwards, which is higher than the Bible of *Charles the Great*; these I have intimated are like to shew that St. *Jerom's* Bible had not *this text*. Mr. *Martin* suspects they are not so antient; this indeed must rest at present, on the judgment of that *excellent Critic*, as Mr. *Martin* does, and all must allow him to be. Next he says, the *Book is yet to be written*: but I hope the *manuscripts* are not. Then he observes that the Doctor takes no notice, whether every one of these manuscripts be of the whole New Testament, or only of parts of it. I know not well how this matter lies; but I suppose the latter with Mr. *Martin*, and understand it so, that some have one part, and some another, one can't expect it otherwise: but if all, that contain St. *John's* Epistle, want this verse, 'tis all we need.

But

But when he concludes so daringly against me, ^{Examinat.}
I am well assured the Doctor and the Manuscripts ^{ch. ii. at}
will give him up to his bad cause; and that mine, ^{the end.}
which is the cause of truth, has nothing to fear
from that quarter. I know not what to say, but
 that Mr. Martin is a man of great assurance; for
 whatever the Doctor may do, I am not afraid of
 the manuscripts; and I wonder how Mr. Martin
 pretends to come at this assurance, when any
 other man will see no encouragement to it from
 the Letter I mentioned; and I have reason to
 think, if the Doctor publish them in *his* time,
 Mr. Martin may fall from the height of his vain
 assurance into a shameful disappointment, and
 yet the *cause of truth* receive no hurt. Nor
 shall I be ashamed to shelter myself, which Mr.
 Martin upbraids me with, *under these manu-*
scripts; I'm sure not so much, as if I had shel-
 tered myself under the *Berlin manuscript*. But I
 can forgive his contempt of manuscripts, when I
 consider that he has *none* to take shelter under;
 and, as confident as he is, shall only tell him,
 that this *great Critic*, who has these manuscripts,
 in a late public Lecture at the university of *Cam-*
bridge upon *this text* has been very far from de-
 fending it.

And the learned Dr. *Waterland*, Master of *Mag-*
dalen College in that University, has not thought
this text once worthy to be mention'd by him, in
 his late very large *Vindication of Christ's Di-*
vinity †: which none will think to be from for-
 getfulness; tho Mr. *Martin*, with as little rea-
 son, supposes it of the primitive writers.

CHAP.

† Mr. *Whiston* in his memoirs of the life of Dr. *S. Clarke*,
 p. 101. says, "This treatise [our Author's Inquiry into the au-
 thority of 1 John v. 7.] "as I have been inform'd, was allud-
 ed to by Dr. *Bentley* in his own famous Lecture at *Cambridge*,

CHAP. IV.

Of the two antient Greek writers that are pretended to quote this text, and of the Latin writers.

I Have urged against *this text*, that not one genuine Greek writer is found to have cited it on any occasion, for many hundred, I believe not for a thousand years; and yet who so likely to know the Greek copies, as the Greeks themselves?

Examinat.
ch. xv.

Mr. Martin says, that if it be so, the text will lose but one proof, which may be dispensed with. But yet he will not let it go without a struggle for it: and therefore produces the two passages from uncertain authors among Athanasius's works; the first from the *Synopsis Scripturae*, which, he says, F. Montfaucon allows at least to be eight hundred years old. Mr. Martin thinks it to be Athanasius's own. However, 'tis no matter which, because 'tis little to the purpose what he has

" when he stood candidate for the chair of *Regius Professor*,
 " wherein he intirely gave up that text, and publicly proved
 " it to be spurious; I have been also informed, that when Dr.
 " Waterland was ask'd, *Whether Dr. Bentley's arguments did*
 " *not convince him*; he replied, *No, for he was convinced*
 " *before*: Nor does the Doctor, I think, ever quote that
 " text as genuine in any of his writings, which in so zealous
 " and warm a Trinitarian deserves to be taken great notice
 " of, as a singular instance of honesty and impartiality."
 But whether Dr. Waterland was displeased with this commendation, or whether it proceeded from some other motive, he has sufficiently clear'd himself from all suspicion of impartiality in this respect, and has quoted it in capital characters in his *Importance of the doctrine of the Trinity*, p. 269. without informing the world of the reason why he forbore to mention it before, or what new light he had discover'd which induced him to urge it now. See *Christian Liberty asserted* in answer to Dr. Waterland's *Importance*, &c. p. 67.

has said, viz. That *St. John* in his first Epistle, shews the unity of the Son with the Father; which I have said might well be a reference to *ch. 2. v. 23.* Mr. Martin says, this verse does not shew that unity; and also that this writer had done with the second, third, and fourth chapters, and that these words were spoken upon the fifth, and on this cries out, *there's no going back.*

As to myself, I am not about going back, but can prove my point; but if he means that the author must not go back from the fifth chapter to the second, he has spoken too late; for he has done it long ago. For, as he did not keep any strict order, but wrote as things occur'd to his memory, after something said on the third *ch. v. 8.* he goes back to the second, and after mentioning the *sin unto death*, and *not to death*, in the fifth, returns to the fourth, about trying the Spirits, whether they be from God; so having mention'd these words, of the *Unity of the Son and Father*, he immediately connects with them the express words of *ch. 2. 23.* And that he who denies the Son hath not the Father; by which we may see what his eye was upon: and indeed was it *Athanasius*, and had he referred to our text; who can doubt but he would have said, *St. John* shews the *Trinity*, or the *Unity of the Father, Son, and Spirit*; and that he would have mention'd this text twenty times over in his other writings? So that this is but a very poor evidence.

His other author is that of a dialogue between *Athanasius* and *Arius*; none knows who he was, and 'tis disputed whether a *Greek* or a *Latin*. Dr. Cave says, it was some raving Monk: Mr. Martin asserts at all adventures, that he was an honest orthodox Christian. Near the end of his work he drops a short sentence, *Add to this, St. John says*

the three are one; which looks like a small postscript added. The words *οἱ τρεῖς τὸ ἐν εἰσι*, have one little particle, one syllable *too much* for the seventh verse of St *John*; and one *too little* for the eighth: so that it determines nothing. Mr. *Martin* takes no notice of this, and is not just in saying, that *without the word eis, the seventh verse* (any more than the eighth) is hinted at. So that we have not one single testimony to depend on from any or all the *Greek* writers, who yet were possessed of the *Greek Testaments*.

I shall not therefore be very anxious about the *Latin African* writers in the *fifth century* or afterwards; tho this indeed is Mr. *Martin's* only plausible plea for the authority of the *text*. As to St. *Cyprian*, nothing is said to invalidate the account of *Facundus*, which is confirmed also by *Fulgentius*, (as I conceive from the word *confiteetur*) and which clears that matter. But as for all the others after him, in the *fifth age*, above a hundred years after *Arius* and *Albanasius's* time; and to whose allegations we have no *answers* of the *Arians* handed down to us, all being suppressed or lost; for there is no doubt but they had something to say, or they yielded the victory to their adversaries, who would not have been wholly silent of such a triumph, obtained by means of a text which their forefathers, in the heat of that long controversy, had never once thought of: I say, as for these, *supposing* their testimonies to be taken from the seventh verse, and that they had the eighth besides, which does not appear; and *supposing* their writings had not been altered by the revisers or publishers who caused them to be printed; who so often have adapted their Scripture citations to the *vulgar version*, (which F. *Simon* says we must keep in mind, in reading the *Latin Fathers*

Fathers who lived before St. *Jerom's* version was received;) of which I took notice formerly in speaking of *Eucherius's* testimony; yet there is one thing to be considered of great weight, which is more than *supposed*, and is fully proved, *viz.* That in *their* time, and before it, there was a great deal of confusion and variety in the *Latin* copies of the New Testament, and many *illustrations* added, even in *Cyprian's* † time: and this was the occasion of † F. Si-
St. *Jerom's* correcting the New Testament; ^{mon's}
as Mr. *Martin* cannot deny. St. *Jerom* com- ^{Crit. Hist.}
plains of these matters, in his *Preface* to the ^{of Verf. of}
Gospels. ^{N. Test.}
^{ch. 6.}

In answer to some who found fault with his design, *If*, he replied, *they say that the Latin copies are to be credited, let them tell me which; for there are almost as many different copies as there are books; why should we not have recourse to the Greek original, to correct the faults which proceeded either from bad translation, or unjust corrections, or from additions and alterations by careless copiers?* And St. *Augustin* had such an opinion of these corruptions of the *Latin* Bibles of the New Testament, that, with respect to their difference from the *Greek* originals and St. *Jerom's* new version, he calls them the *old Falsities*, in his afore-mentioned epistle: *If any one, thro' contention, shall plead for the old falsity, he is easily convinced or confuted by producing and comparing the (Greek) * copies.* By this we may discern how the *Latin* Bibles differed, and that it was very possible, nay easy for St. *Augustin's* to want, what some other *African's* Bible might have, at least after his time: and 'tis absurd to talk of one com-
^{mon}

* Unde si quispiam veteri falsitati contentiosius faverit, prolatis collatisque codicibus vel docetur facillimè, vel refellitur.

mon Bible of all the Latin Churches, out of which their citations were taken; when 'tis from these citations that the difference of their Books appear.

And therefore since St *Jerom's* business was to correct such *interpolations*, *omissions*, and *alterations*, it follows that if he did not retain *this verse* in his Bible, he, if he found it at all, esteemed it as a spurious addition. Indeed it was likely enough such a fine mystical sense of the *Water, Blood, and Spirit*, being so common among them, some or other would add it (as they oft did other words) by way of illustration, to the text itself; and so it would remain: for tho St. *Jerom* reformed the *Latin* version, yet it was not received presently, but made its way by degrees in some ages before the other version was laid aside: and many reformed, and corrected the other by St. *Jerom's*, in the places which they thought to be corrupted, some in one place, some in another; which caused great confusion in the *Latin Manuscripts*; and, I may add, gave great trouble to the *Revisers* who came after: but withal it gave them an handle to omit, or keep in some passages, as might be most agreeable to the sentiments of the time they lived in.

See Bingham's
Antiq.
Vol. 6.
p. 443.

And therefore if St. *Jerom* had not this *Text*, it is of no great weight, that some copies, supposed to be taken from that of *Charles the Great*, have it. Indeed Mr. *Martin* supposes such abundance of good and great things concerning those *Revisers* under that prince, that they were so judicious, so exact, so careful, so impartial, and consulted so many, and the best *Latin Manuscripts*, and *Greek* ones too, and that they kept in this verse also; that he would leave us no room for any doubt, but all was right: but

but the world has been so oft deceiv'd with such pretenses, that they will not now pass, when contradicted by rational arguments, and by strong evidence on the other side, from all the *Greek* manuscripts, which are older, as some of them are, than those times, and from all the *Greek* Fathers, and even from St. *Jerom* himself, as I hope is made to appear. For tho Mr. *Martin*, with all his pretenses to logic, is unreasonable in expecting positive proofs of a *negative* point; yet I have just reason to require a positive proof of the *affirmative*, (not mere presumptions) viz. That this text is, or ever was, in any antient *Greek* manuscripts, or even in St. *Jerom*'s own version corrected by them.

And therefore, when Mr. *Martin* can inform us truly, that one of his many supposed, *mislaid*, or *lost* *Greek* manuscripts, is found again, the world will be ready to hear of it; but when a controversy comes to consist only of tedious repetitions, and personal reflexions, 'tis a sign it either is near to an end, or ought to be so.

CH A P. V.

Of the Dublin Manuscript, call'd Codex Montfortius.

THE *Codex Montfortius* was formerly well known, being mention'd in the *English Polyglot* publish'd by *Walton*, and in Dr. *Mill*'s *Prolegomena* and *Notes*; in both which works the various readings of it are inserted, as far as to the first chapter of the epistle to the *Romans*: but whether it reach'd any farther, was not known, nor where it was deposited, till the learned Father *le Long* inform'd the world of it in his letter to Mr. *Martin*, printed in the *Journal des Savans* of June 1720. who having seen Mr. *Martin*'s *Dissertation on 1 John 5. 7.* wrote to him, among

among other things, that it was certain that *Robert Stephens* had but *seven Greek manuscripts* which contain'd the canonical epistles, and that this verse in question was not found in any of them; he having examin'd this matter strictly, at the desire of Dr. *Roger Dean of Burges*, who had lately wrote in defence of this text. In short, he adds, that *he knew but of two Greek manuscripts where it was to be found, to wit, the Codex Britannicus cited by Erasmus, and the Codex Montfortius made use of in Walton's Polyglot, which last, says he, is preserved in the library of the University of Dublin.*

After this Mr. *Martin* receiv'd from Mr. *Ycard*, Dean of *Aconry*, who was then at *Dublin*, an extract of this passage, which was compar'd with the original by him and the library-keeper. This original mark'd G 97. was among the manuscripts of the great Archbishop *Usher*. In this copy is found the verse in dispute, viz. *There are three that bear witness in heaven, Father, Word, and Holy Spirit; and these three are one* *.

Having read Father *le Long's* Letter, and being desirous to know how the state of that *Dublin* copy was as to this point, my learned and worthy friend Dr. *Samuel Clarke* wrote to Dr. *Evans* then Bishop of *Meath*, to procure a transcript of that part of St. *John's* Epistle, who it seems desired the same Mr. *Ycard* to do it; whose letter to the Bishop with the said transcript, I have now before me, and which agrees with the account given by Mr. *Martin*.

Dr. *Mill's* account of this copy is, that 'tis written in a modern and careless hand; and the form of the letters is, as Mr. *Martin* owns and I have seen, that of our Greek editions, with accents and spirits. The Doctor says, that some learned

* *Martin's La verité du texte de la 1 John 5. 7. p. 272.*

learned man has here and there blotted out some things, which he thought were interpolations ; and that in the text itself there is a great number of readings which are altogether singular, or such as are not found in our books. And I may add one thing more, that in this place of St. *John*, the words, *these three are one*, are but once found, to wit, in *ver. 7.* and wholly omitted in the 8th *verse*. What antiquity this manuscript, or that from which it was copy'd, was of, Mr. *Martin* owns he can't certainly demonstrate ; but yet he has endeavour'd to raise an opinion of its antiquity by a suggestion wholly groundless. He is well assur'd indeed it could not be before the eleventh century, because the prologues of *Theophylact* are found in it, who liv'd towards the middle of that age : but then he insinuates, that it might be written at the end of that age, and says there would be no room to doubt it, if we could be assur'd that the date which is found there at the end of St. *Mark's* gospel, is by the same hand that wrote the copy ; for there, as it was sent to him, it is, ἐγράφη μετὰ χρόνους δέκα τῆς τοῦ Χυ ἀναλήψεως ; that is, as he interprets it, *written after ten ages from the ascension of Christ* : And this he says points to the eleventh age. Now either Mr. *Martin* had a lame account sent him, and so might be ignorant of the matter ; or else artfully conceal'd what quite overthrows all his supposition, by omitting what it was that is said to be written at that time, viz. τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μάρκον ἐγράφη, &c. *The gospel according to St. Mark was written, &c.* Why was this omitted, but that it might appear as if that was said of the whole copy, which is only said of *Mark's* original gospel, which of old was † supposed to be written

† See *Du Pin's History of the Canon*, vol. II. p. 42. and Dr. *Mill's* notes at the end of St. *Mark* ; by which it appears that

ten ten years after Christ's death? Likewise in the *Dublin* MS. there is a note of the same kind at the end of St. *John's* gospel also, relating to the time of that gospel's being written. This I myself observ'd, when I had a short view of that MS. at *Dublin*, in *August* 1725. So that supposing we grant Mr. *Martin* that the passage was written by the same hand with the copy, yet there is not the least foundation for his inference, that it was wrote in the eleventh age: nor does *χρῶς* here signify centuries or *ages*, but *years*; which sure none will pretend was design'd for the date of this copy, but rather of the original gospel. From all which it does not appear to have any marks of antiquity.

Thus having laid the matter before the world, I leave it to the learned to judge of its value and authority; while yet it is the *only* Greek copy, among such great numbers, in which this contested verse appears to be found.

I shall only add, what Mr. *Ycard* writes in his letter, "That it is writ *currente calamo*; and
 " that the seven canonical epistles, as well as the
 " book of the *Revelation*, did seem to him to be
 " writ with such haste, that he thought it was
 " writ at one sitting, and with the same pen —
 " And that as a proof of the haste of the wri-
 " ter, in *ver.* 13. he has omitted all from the
 " first *θεῶν*." Now whether such a hasty and modern transcript can be depended upon for its exactness, or authority, I leave to the judgment of others †.

POSTSCRIPT.

that those words were added in divers MSS. at the end of St. *Mark's* gospel.

† Of this *Dublin* manuscript Mr. *la Croze*, that eminent critic, and so well versed in manuscripts, declares, that he has but a *low opinion*, being convinced from the shape of the letters, that it is of a very modern date. See his Letter hereto subjoin'd.

POSTSCRIPT.

THREE LETTERS. One from Father Le Long, Priest of the Oratory at Paris, to Mr. Martin, relating to R. Stephens's manuscripts.

Two from Mr. La Croze, Library-keeper to the King of Prussia at Berlin, relating to the Dublin and Berlin manuscripts.

A Letter from Father Le Long to Mr. Martin.

De Paris ce 12 Avril, 1720.

MONSIEUR,

JE vous dois Monsieur un remerciement de la maniere obligeante dont vous parlez de moi, p. 17. de votre *Dissertation* sur les 3 temoins celestes de St. Jean. Il y a long tems que je me serois acquitté de cette obligation, si elle m'estoit tombée plustot entre les mains ; je ne l'ay eue que hier, & apres avoir parcouru ce que vous dites touchant les MSS. de Rob. Estienne, vous voulez bien que je vous parle avec la franchise & la sincerité que vous reconnoissez en moi. Je ne touche point à l'authenticité de ce *texte*. J'assure seulement icy qu'il n'est dans aucun des MSS dont Ro. Estienne s'est servi pour l'edition Grecque du N. Test. de 1650. Ces deux sentimens se peuvent soutenir sans aucune contradiction. Mr. l'Abbé Roger Dr. & Doyen de l'eglise metropolitaine de Bourges a defendu avec force l'authenticité de ce *texte* : Il avoüe cependant qu'il ne l'a point trouvé dans ces MSS. Ce fut ce scavant Abbe, qui lorsqu'il travailloit a sa *Dissertation* m'engagea a

examiner si ce fameux passage se trouvoit dans les MSS. de la bibliotheque du Roi qui y estoient déjà du tems d' *Henry II.* & qui sont cités par *Rob. Estienne.* Il eut peu de tems apres, etant venu a *Paris*, la satisfaction de reconnoître par lui-mesme la verité de ce que je lui avois mandé, que ce passage ne se trouvoit dans aucun de ces manuscrits.

Vous soutenez d'abord p. 110. que *Rob. Estienne* a eu 16 MSS. Grecs outre l'edition d' *Alcala*; mais si l'on ne veut pas mettre au nombre de ces MSS. celui sur lequel a été faite cette edition, il faut convenir qu'il a oublié un MS. en faisant dans sa preface le denombrement de ceux dont il s'est servi, & meme il ne cite jamais dans les marges interieures de 17 Ex. dont il ait tiré des varietés des leçons. Il marque pour le premier de ces exemplaires l'edition d' *Alcala*; pour le second les variantes que ses amis ont envoyé d' *Italie*, les 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, & 15, ont été tirés, de la bibliotheque du Roy *Henry II.* Les autres lui sont venus d'ailleurs. Dans la premiere preface écrite en Grec il les designe par les lettres numerales Grecques α, β, γ, δ, ε, ς, ζ, η, θ, ι, ια, ιβ, ιγ, ιδ, ιε, ις.

Robert Estienne declare p. 36. de sa réponse au Theologiens de *Paris* qu'il a remis dans la bibliotheque du Roi les MSS. qu'on lui avoit confiés. Voicy de quelle maniere je m'y suis pris pour les y decouvrir.

J'ai cherché dans les marges interieures de l'edition du N. Test. Grec de *Rob. Estienne* des varietés des leçons tirées des huit MSS. de la bibliotheque du Roi. J'en ai pris au moins quatre des plus singulieres pour chacun; je me suis adressé a Mr. *Boirvin*, l'un des gardes de cette bibliotheque qui est chargé du soin des MSS. et qui a un si grande connoissance du Grec, dont il a fait une

étude

étude particuliere ; comme il est un des hommes les plus obligeants ; il rechercha sur le champ les MSS. du N. Test. Grecs qui se conservoient dans cette bibliotheque du tems de *Henry II.* qui sont distingués des autres par un H. couronné marqué sur la couronne, il s'en trouve onze, entre lesquelles 8 contenoient les varietés des leçons que j'avois tiré des marges interieures de l'edition d'*Estienne*. Peut on apres cela douter que ces ne soient ceux dont il s'est servi ? peut estre qu'il a negligé les 3 autres, ou qu'ils ne sont venus, qu'apres sa sortie de *France*, dans cette bibliotheque.

Vous verrez par la table suivante ce que chacun de ces MSS. contient, & par ce que j'ai trouvé dans les MSS. du Roi j'ai déterminé ce qui devoit estre dans les autres que *R. Estienne* avoit eu d'ailleurs. Il n'y a que quatre MSS. du Roi qui contiennent les epistres canoniques δ, ε, ζ, ι. numerotes 2871, 3445, 2242, & 2878. Encore le ζ n'a t'il que la 1 epistre de *St. Jean*, ce qui suffit. Je n'y ai point trouvé le verset en question : ainsi j'ai droit de conclure qu'il n'estoit dans aucun des MSS. d'*Estienne* ; c'est a dire dans les 3 autres θ, ια, ιγ, qui avec les 4 precedents font le nombre de sept, qui sont les memes marqués en marge a coté de ce verset dans l'edition d'*Estienne*.

Vous pourrez dire que *R. Estienne* ne marque en cette endroit pour variantes que ces mots ἡ τῷ ὑπαὶ, qui en effet sont enfermés seules entre l'obole et la cedile, et qu'il ne manquoit que ces mots dans les 7 MSS. d'*Estienne*, & que par consequent ces ne sont pas ceux qui sont a present dans la bibliotheque du Roi, dans lesquelles le passage entier ne se trouve point ; mais avant que de vous répondre en forme a cette specieuse objection, vous voulez bien que je vous dise que

cette edition Grecque du N. Test. n'est pas aussi correcte, du moins les citations, qu'on le croit ordinairement; je vous en produirai plus de six fausses s'il est necessaire, entre lesquelles je place la citation du MS. 10. ou le 14. cité a coté du ver. 4. du chapitre 1. de la 2 Epitre de St. *Pierre*, ce MS. ne contient que les *Evangelies*, ainsi il n'a pas dû estre cité sur cette epistre, il falloit mettre 17, MS. qui contient les epistres canoniques, & il est tres aisé en composant ou de prendre une casse pour la voisine, ou en decomposant une feuille d'impression de mettre une lettre dans une casse pour une autre; la correction estoit plus difficile a faire.

Les personnes les plus exactes ne font pas toujours attention, par exemple, il vous estoit aisé, puisque vous aviez en main *La Bibliotheque Sacrée*, de reconnoître dans le titre que l'auteur n'estoit pas un scavant *Benedictin*, mais un prestre de l'*Oratoire*; vous avez sans doute confondu la congregation de l'*Oratoire* avec celle de St. *Maur*.

Pour venir a vostre objection, je dis que la cédile placée apres ἐν τῷ ἱερῶ a dû estre apres ἐν τῇ γῇ, du verset suivant; car tout ce qui est renfermé entre ces deux extremities ne se trouve ni dans les versions *Orientales*, ni dans presque aucun MS. Grec; je ne connois que deux ou cela se rencontre, le *Codex Britannicus* cité souvent par *Erasme*, & le *Codex Montfortius* de la *Polyglotte* d'*Angleterre*, qui se conserve dans la bibliotheque de l'academie de *Dublin* en *Irlande*. Comme il se rencontre trois differences dans ce seul verset entre ces 2 MSS. on peut asseurer que ces ne sont pas les mêmes. Qu'on nomme & indique les autres MSS. Grecs ou on lise ce verset si on en connoit. Il n'est pas certainement dans onze de la bibliotheque du Roi, ni dans ceux de la bibliotheque de Mr. *Colbert*, ni dans 8 de bibliotheque de

Rome

Rome en 1632. qui sont les seuls qui ayent les epistres canoniques. Il faut donc avouer que la variante d'*Estienne* commence a ces mots ἐν τῷ ἁπλῷ, et qu'elle finit apres ceux ἐν τῇ γῇ, quoique Mr. *Simon* ait dit mal a propos que ces dernieres paroles se trouvent dans un des MSS. de Mr. *Colbert*, ou je puis assurer qu'ils ne se trouvent point dans les MSS. cités par Mr. *Simon*, apres une exacte recherche que j'en ai faite.

Il doit donc demeurer pour constant que *R. Estienne* n'ayant que 7 MSS. Grecs qui contiennent les epistres canoniques, comme on le verra par la table suivante, & que le verset en question ne s'y trouvant point, il n'est dans aucun des MSS. d'*Estienne*, qui est tout ce que j'avois promis de prouver.

J'ajouterai que vostre raisonnement n'est pas concluant, quand vous dites que les MSS. d'*Estienne* contenoient le N. T. en 2 volumes, que le premier renfermoit les Evangiles & les Actes, et le second les epistres des Apostres et l'Apocalypse. Il semble que vous ayez vû ces anciens MSS. pour parlez aussi positivement que vous faites: Les MSS. Grecs sont plus ou moins espais, plus ou moins entiers selon qu'ils ont été bien conservés: pour ne parler que des MSS. du N. T. les uns contiennent le N. T. en entier, dans les autres il en manque une partie. Plusieurs n'ont que les quatre *Evangiles*, d'autres les *Actes*, & les epistres des *Apostres*, des *Troisiemes* les *Actes* & les epistres des *St. Paul*, des quatriemes les *Actes* & les epistres *Canoniques*; on trouve dans fort peu le livre de l'Apocalypse: Ainsi la conclusion que vous tirez n'est pas certain, que les MSS. qui contiennent les epistres de *St. Paul* doivent aussi contenir les epistres *Canoniques*.

J'espere que vous recevrez en bonne part la liberté que je prends de vous dire sur ce fait

ma pensée, & quoique nous differions de sentiment, vous ne m'en croirez pas avec moins d'estime & de veneration,

Monsieur,

Vostre tres-humble

& tres-obeïssant Serviteur,

Le Long, Prestre de L'Oratoire.

Paris, 12 April 1720.

S I R,

I Return you many thanks for the obliging manner, wherein you speak of me *p.* 17. of your Dissertation on the three witnesses in heaven in *St. John*. I should have acknowledged that obligation long ago, if I had met with your Dissertation sooner, but I had it not till yesterday; and after having run over what you say in relation to *Robert Stephens's* manuscripts, you will allow me to speak to you with that freedom and sincerity, which you acknowledge in me.

I don't meddle with the authenticnes of the text, only I assure you that it is *not in any* of the manuscripts, which *Robert Stephens* made use of in his *Greek* edition of the New Testament in the year 1650. These two opinions are very consistent with each other. Mr. the Abbe Roger Dr. and Dean of the metropolitan church of *Bourges* hath strongly defended the authenticnes of this text, but nevertheless acknowledges that he could not find it in these manuscripts. It was this learned Abbè, who, when he was employed in his dissertation, engaged me to examine, whether this famous passage was to be found in those manuscripts of the king's library, which had been there from the time of *Henry the II^d*. and which are cited by

by *Robert Stephens*. He came to *Paris* soon after, and had the satisfaction of observing himself the truth of what I had wrote him, that this passage was not to be found in any of these manuscripts.

You set out with asserting that *Robert Stephens* had 16 *Greek* manuscripts, besides the edition of *Alcala*, but unless you count into the number of those manuscripts that from whence the edition was made, it must be agreed, that he has forgot one manuscript in reckoning up in his preface the number of those which he made use of, and besides he never cites in the inward margin the seventeenth copy from which he drew his various readings. He marks for his first copy the edition of *Alcala*, for his second the various readings sent him by his friends from *Italy*, the 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 10th, and 15th, are taken from the library of King *Henry the II*d. the others he had from elsewhere; in his first preface written in *Greek* he marks them by the *Greek* numeral Letters, α, β, γ, δ, ε, ζ, η, θ, ι, κ, λ, μ, ν, ξ, ο, π, ρ, σ, τ, υ, φ, χ, ψ, ω.

Robert Stephens declares p. 36. of his answer to the *Divines* of *Paris*, that he had replaced in the king's library the manuscripts, which he had been trusted with from thence. The way I took to find them out there was thus; I searched in the inward margin of *Robert Stephens*'s edition of the *Greek* New Testament the various readings extracted from the eight manuscripts of the king's library. I took out of them four at least, the most remarkable in each, and then waited on Mr. *Baivin* one of the keepers of that library, who has the care of the manuscripts, and who is well skill'd in the *Greek* language, which he has made his peculiar study: being a Man of a very obliging temper, he immediately

mediately look'd for those *Greek* manuscripts of the New Testament, which were kept in that library in the time of *Henry* the II^d. which are distinguished from the rest by a crowned H. marked above the crown. He found *eleven* of them, *eight* of which had those various readings, which I had taken from the inner margin of *Stephens's* edition. Can any doubt be made after this, that these were the very manuscripts, which he had made use of? It may be he did not regard the other *three*, or perhaps they were not brought into that library till after *Stephens's* departure from *France*.

You will see by the following table what each of these manuscripts contains, and by what I have found in the king's manuscripts, I have been able to judge what must be in the others, which *R. Stephens* had elsewhere. There are but four of the King's manuscripts which contain the canonical epistles, *θ*, *ι*, *ζ*, *ι*, number'd 2871, 3445, 2242, and 2878; and the *ζ* has only the first epistle of *St. John*, which is sufficient. In none of these could I find the verse in question, so that I may justly conclude that it is not in any of *Stephens's* manuscripts, that is to say in the three others *θ*, *ι*, *ι*, which with the four abovementioned make up the number seven, and are the same which are marked in the margin on the side of this verse in *Stephens's* edition.

Perhaps you will say that *R. Stephens* marks no other various reading in this place but with relation to the words *ἐν τῷ ὑμῶν*, (which indeed is all that is included within the two marks) and that these were the only words wanting in the seven manuscripts of *Stephens*, and by consequence that those manuscripts were not the same with them at present in the King's library, in which the whole passage is wanting. But before I answer

swer in form to this specious objection, you will permit me to tell you, that this edition of the *Greek New Testament* is not so correct, at least the citations are not, as is generally believed; I could produce you, if it were necessary, more than six errors, among which I reckon the citation from MS. 18, or the 14th cited on the side of the 4th verse of the 1st chap. of the second epistle of S. *Peter*; this manuscript contains only the gospels, and therefore ought not to have been cited on this epistle, it ought to have been M.S. 17, [the 13th] which does contain the canonical epistles: It is very easy either in *composing* to mistake one box for another, or in *distributing* a sheet of the impression to put a letter into the wrong box; the correcting it afterwards is not so easy. *

The most exact don't always give proper attention; for example, it was a very easy matter for you, as you had in your hand *La Bibliothèque Sacrée*, to have observed in the title, that the author was not a learned *Benedictin*, but a Priest of the *Oratory*; you must certainly have confounded the college of the *Oratory* with that of St. *Maur*.

But to come close to your objection, I say that the mark, placed after ἐν τῷ ἑκτονῷ, ought to have been placed after ἐν τῷ γῆ in the next verse, for all, that is included within those two extremities, is wanting not only in the oriental versions, but in almost every *Greek* manuscript. I know *but of two* which have it, viz. the *Codex Britannicus* often cited by *Erasmus*, and the *Codex*

* It seems from hence, that not only Mr. *Martin* was mistaken in imagining the MS. 18 contained the seven canonical or catholic epistles, but Dr. *Mill* also in supposing, that at the end of that MS. were two leaves containing a part of the 10th chapter of the *Acts* and the first chapter of the 2d epistle of *Peter*. See *Millii Prolegomena*, N°. 1174. and our Author's Answer to Mr. *Martin*, p. 207.

dex Montfortius in the *English Polyglotte*, which is preserved in the Library of the University of *Dublin* in *Ireland*. As there are three differences between the two manuscripts in this single verse, one may be assured that they are not the same. * Let them name and point out those other *Greek* manuscripts where this verse is found, if they know of any such. It is certainly not in the *eleven* of the *King's* library, nor in those of *Mr. Colbert's* library, nor in the eight of the library at *Rome* in 1632, which are the only ones that have the canonical epistles. It must therefore be admitted, that the various reading of *Stephens* begins with these words $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omega\ \epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\eta$, and ends after the words $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\eta\ \gamma\eta$, notwithstanding *Mr. Simon* unadvisedly says, that these last words are found in one of *Mr. Colbert's* manuscripts; for I can assure you upon an exact search which I have made, that they are not to be found there in the manuscripts cited by *Mr. Simon*.

It remains therefore undeniable, since *R. Stephens* had *but seven* *Greek* manuscripts, which contained the canonical epistles, as may be seen in the following table, and the verse in question is *not in any of them*, that it is not in *any* of *Stephens's* manuscripts, which is all that I undertook to prove.

I shall only add, that your reasoning is by no means conclusive, when you say that *Stephens's* manuscripts contained the New Testament in two volumes, the *first* including the Gospels and the Acts, the *second* including the Epistles of the Apostles and the Revelation. One would think you had seen these antient manuscripts, to speak so positively of them as you do. The *Greek* manuscripts are more or less thick, more or less entire, according as they have been preserved. To speak only of the manuscripts of the New Testament, some contain the whole New Testament, others want a part, many have

* See *Mr. Martin's Dissertation*. p. 75.

have only the four Gospels, others the Acts and the Epistles of the Apostles, a third sort have the Acts and the Epistles of St. Paul, a fourth the Acts and the canonical Epistles, and very few have the Revelation; so that the conclusion you draw is very far from true, that the manuscripts, which contained the Epistles of St. Paul, must also contain the canonical epistles.

I hope you will not be displeased at the liberty I have taken to tell you my thoughts on this matter, and tho we differ in opinion you will nevertheless believe me to be with great respect and esteem,

Sir,

Your most humble,

and most obedient servant,

Le Long, Priest of the Oratory.

A Table of the manuscripts made use of by Robert Stephens in his folio edition of the New Testament. 1550.

α — The, *Alcala* or *Complutensian* edition; containing all the New Testament.

β — The four Gospels, and Acts of the Apostles.

γ — The four Gospels, the King's MS. N°. 2867.

δ — The New Testament, excepting the Revelation, the King's MS. N°. 2871.

ε — The New Testament, excepting the Revelation, the King's MS. N°. 3425.

ς — The four Gospels.

ζ — The four Gospels, the Epistles of St. Paul, St. James, St. Peter, and the first of St. John, the King's MS. N°. 2242.

η — The four Gospels, the King's MS. N°. 2361.

θ — The New Testament, excepting the Revelation. The

- 1— The Acts and the Epistles of the Apostles, the King's M.S. N^o 2878.
- 1a— The Acts and the Epistles of the Apostles.
- 1b— The four Gospels.
- 1c— The Acts and the Epistles of the Apostles, except the third of St. *John* and that of St. *Jude*.
- 1d— The Gospels of St. *Matthew*, St. *Luke*, and St. *John*.
- 1e— Seven Epistles of St. *Paul*, beginning with the first to the *Corinthians*, the King's MS.
- 1f— The Gospels of St. *Luke* and St. *John*.

N. B. In all this number are found *only seven* manuscripts of the first epistle of St. *John*, viz. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, which are the very same we find cited in the margin over-against the famous verse in R. *Stephens's* Greek edition.

*A Letter from Mr. LaCroze, to a Friend of Mr. Martin, to be forwarded to him, as published by Mr. Martin, Verité du Texte, 1 John 5. 7. p. 203 *.*

MONSIEUR,

JE lus hier la dissertation de M. *Mill* sur le passage de St. *Jean*, & j'y ai trouvé presque tout ce que j'ai avois médité sur le même sujet: je ferai

* N. B. This, I suppose, is the information refer'd to by Mr. *La Croze*, in his letter of Dec. 31, 1719. See our Author's Reply to Mr. *Martin*, p. 230. and tho the date be not inserted, yet since Mr. *Martin* says *La Verité du text. &c.* p. 219. that it was wrote *some years* before the other, it is probably the same, which lay before him in the year 1717, at the time of his first urging this *Berlin* manuscript in his Dissertation on this text p. 106. *French* edit. & p. 57. *English* edit. See Mr. *Martin's* Examination of Mr. *Emlyn's* answer, p. 101.

serai bien aise que M. *Martin* appuye sur de nouvelles preuves l'autorité de ce témoignage, mais entre vous & moi la chose me paroît difficile. Je me persuade à peu près que c'est une glose fondée sur l'explication de S. *Cyprien*, qui de la marge s'est insinuée dans le texte. Tous les anciens manuscrits *Grecs* & *Latins* dans le denombrement des trois témoins ne font mention que de l'esprit, de l'eau, & du sang. Il ne faut pas compter sur notre manuscrit *Grec* du N. Testament : c'est un ouvrage auquel, quoi qu'il ait trompé plusieurs personnes, je n'ai jamais donné 80. ans d'antiquité. L'an 1696. étant nouvellement arrivé à *Berlin*, j'allai voir la Bibliothèque, où on me montra ce manuscrit qu'on me faisoit environ de mille ans : après l'avoir examiné un moment, je soutins qu'il étoit recent, copié d'après l'édition de la Bible du Cardinal *Ximenes* : j'en convainquis feu M. de *Spanheim*, & le Bibliothecaire d'alors par la confrontation des passages, la ressemblance des caracteres, & par d'autres preuves sensibles : le passage des trois témoins y est mot à mot, comme à la Bible d' *Alcala*, & il ne pouvoit pas y être autrement. . . . Les anciens peres ne se sont jamais servis d'un passage si remarquable. . . . Le lectionnaire intitulé *Απόστολος*, ou *Πράξις*, n'a ce me semble en cela que fort peu d'autorité ; je ne doute point de son antiquité, mais ces livres ecclesiastiques sont plus sujets au changement que les autres. . . . Je vous ai écrit tout ceci pour ne pas manquer à la parole que je vous avois donnée ; car je suis persuadé que je n'ai proposé aucune difficulté qui n'ait été pesée par M. *Martin*, &c.

S I R,

S I R,

I Read yesterday Mr. *Mill's* Dissertation on the passage of *St. John*, and I therein found almost all that had occur'd to me on that subject; I shall be very glad if Mr. *Martin* can support the authority of that testimony by new proofs, but between you and me that is no easy matter. I almost persuade myself that it is a gloss founded upon *St. Cyprian's* interpretation, which from the margin has crept into the text. All the antient manuscripts both *Greek* and *Latin*, in reckoning the three witnesses, make mention only of *the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood*. No account must be made of our *Greek manuscript* of the New Testament, it is a work, which tho it has deceived several, I never judg'd above 80 years old. In the year 1696, when I was newly come to *Berlin*, I went to visit the library, where they show'd me this manuscript, which they represented to me as about a thousand years old: after having examined it a while, I maintained that it was but of late date, and copy'd after Cardinal *Ximenes's* edition of the Bible; of this I convinced M. *de Spanheim* (deceased) and the then * Library-keeper by comparison of passages, the resemblance of the characters, and by other evident proofs: the passage of the three witnesses is there word for word as in the Bible of *Alcala* †, and it could not be there in any other manner. . . . The antient Fathers never made use of this so remarkable a passage The Ritual, intitl'd *Apostolos* or *Praxapostolos*, is with me of very little authority for this purpose; not that I doubt its antiquity, but those ecclesiastical books are more subject to alterations than any others

3

* *Hendreichius*. † *The Complutenian edition of Cardinal Ximenes.*

I have wrote thus much to you to acquit myself of the promise I made you, for I am perswaded I have proposed no difficulties but what M. Martin has considered of, &c.

*A Letter from Mr. La Croze, communicated by Mr. Achard, a celebrated Preacher at Berlin, to the * Author of Histoire d'un Voyage littéraire fait 1733, en France, en Angleterre, & en Hollande, printed at the Hague, 1735.*

Vir Amplissime, & plurimum Reverende,

EPISTOLÆ meæ de commate Divi Joannis Apostoli, nescio quâ factum sit ut fama in Angliam usque deferretur. Nihil enim in ea valdè elaboratum est, cum sit αὐτοχρῆδιας scripta, quo tempore etiam animo & corpore languebam. Et sanè ad eam scribendam accessi ἐκὼν ἀκούσας γε θυμῶ. At illam amico petenti & flagitanti vix negare ausus sum, cum præterea arbitrarer ea, quæ scribebam, clam apud nos habitum iri. Frustra autem à me petis exemplar illius epistolæ, cum nullum unquam, aut valdè raro, apud me Litterarum mearum exemplar servare soleam. Verumtamen totius rei memoriam repetam, addamque nonnulla prout in mentem mihi venient, quæ quæso æqui bonique consulas.

Nunquam animus fuit in pertractando hoc argumento versari. Intellexi, & expertus sum, rem periculo non vacare, cum homines inconsulti, & criterii expertes, statim Christianam Fidem eorum in discrimen vocent, qui sententias suas, etiam temerè admissas, non satis pro arbitrio suo reverentur. Ego verò ex animi mei sententia loquor: pro dogmate certissimo Divinitatis Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, & cæteris quæ inde à theologis nostris deducuntur, vitam ipsam periculo exponere paratus

* C. E. Jordan Privy Counsellor to the present King of Prussia.

paratus sum; at idem dogma, quod manifestò plurimæ Novi Testamenti auctoritates demonstrant, ex dubiis, incertis, addo & falsis, argumentis, nisi cum summo veritatis ipsius periculo, asserti posse numquam existimaverim. Sed tempus est in rem ipsam attentius introspicere.

Hæc potissimum argumenta me ad eam sententiam tuendam, quam nunc propugno, vocaverunt: nimirum veterum patrum, & scriptorum ecclesiasticorum, silentium, quibus addi debet haud adspernanda antiquarum versionum auctoritas. De manuscriptis codicibus nihil dicendum censeo, cum palam fit unum illum codicem *Græcum* Bibliothecæ nostræ, ad quem provocant, ex *Complutensi* editione, manû planè recenti, descriptum esse; quod sæpius & peregrinis adventantibus, & ipsis civibus nostris approbavi, & adhuc cuivis approbare paratus sum. Quæcumque vitia socordiâ typographorum in editionem *Complutensem* irreperunt, ea in codice nostro manuscripto nihil immutata leguntur: etiam litteræ ad formam ejusdem editionis exactæ, & expressæ sunt. Addo novitatem membranæ, atramentum pallidum de industriâ adhibitum, ut nimirum antiquitatem feliciùs mentiretur, & incautos falleret; adeò ut mihi certissimè constet hoc exemplar manuscriptum ab homine improbo & αἰσχρὸν ἐπεδείκνυτο confectum esse, ut grandi pecuniæ summâ emtores emungeret, quod & ipsi pro voto successit. Nec meliùs censeo de codice *Dublinensi*, quem recentissimum esse animadverti ex ipsâ formâ litterarum obiter descriptâ in diario quodam, cujus tamen memoria non succurrit, nec ipse liber est in promptu. Habet & ille codex τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μάρτυρες ἐν τῇ γῇ, ut versio *Græca* concilii Lateranensis, ubi verba versionis vulgatæ habent *in terra*. *Græca* autem ibi ex *Latino* loquuntur, contra consuetam novi Testamenti formulam,

inulam, quæ in rñs. yñs dicere solet; unde affirmare licet ea verba in editiones *Græcas* recentiores irrepsisse ex illâ versione concilii Lateranensis.

In tam locupletis argumento plura dicenda superessent, nisi meminissem me epistolam non *Διατριβὴν* de hoc argumento conscribere. Itaque de patrum consensu & auctoritate postea quàm perpauca addidero, ad illud argumentum accedam de quo præcipuè inter me, & doctissimum *Bencelium*, qui editionem sacrorum Novi Testamenti librorum parat, agebatur. Movit me præcipuè ut à priorē sententia discederem silentium *Atbanasii*, qui nunquam ad illud *Johannis* Apostoli comma provocavit, quod tamen magno ei usui futurum erat, si in ætatis suæ codicibus lectum fuisset. Quod quidam objiciunt, & mihi in ipsa serenissimæ Reginæ mensâ à duobus communionis nostræ theologis dictum est, nequidem apud eundem *Atbanasium* unquam proferri locum qui ad formam administrandi baptismi spectat, id ex turpi ignorantia, quam hic detegere non vacat, ortum est: nam idem locus tam sæpè apud *Atbanasium* legitur, ut mirum sit eos, qui id objiciunt, in eum stuporem incidisse. At ne quid temerè dixisse videar, mittam eos homines ad ipsa *Atbanasii* loca, quæ mihi occurrerunt in genuinis ejus operibus. Utor autem editione nupera Parisiensi. Legitur itaque hic locus p. 237. B. item p. 239. A. B. Item in oratione contra Arianos p. 479. A. B. & in oratione secunda contra eosdem Arianos p. 508. D. F. & p. 509. A. B. Hæc sufficere arbitror; nam supra decem alia loca notavi, à quibus referendis supersedeo. Nec tamen malam fidem eorum accusare velim qui talia objiciunt, sed temeritatem, & supinam ignorantiam. Jam si quis attendat ad Oecumenii commentarium in epistolam Divi *Johannis*, in qua ipse textus inte-

ger extat sine eo commate, cujus proinde nulla mentio fit in commentario; nisi præconceptis opinionibus obnoxius sit, sententiæ nostræ, vel invitus, favere tenebitur. Plurima alia argumenta optimâ fide congeffit doctissimus Millius ad primam *Johannis* epistolam, etsi, levibus argumentis impulsus, alii sententiæ adhærere videatur. Sed in hoc alii inquirent per me licet. Plura præstiti quàm per adversam valetudinem, & oculorum infirmitatem, sperare posse videbar.

Unum modo superest ut dicam de versione *Armenâ*, quæ id comma habet in editionibus *Uscani* episcopi. Ab eo credidissim ex versione vulgatâ additum fuisse, cum nonnulla alia se ab eâ versione excerptisse in præfatione suâ fateatur. Nihil quidem in ipsq̃ contextu *Armenico* mutavit, sed plurima ex *Latina* versione addidit, ut cuilibet *Armenica* & *Latina* conferenti observare proum erit. Ne autem in eâ opinione perseverarem, effecit auctoritas concilii *Sisensis* Anno Christi 1307. in *Ciliciâ*, quæ tunc *Armenia* minor dicebatur, celebrati, ubi pagina 462. apud *Galanum* p. 461. hujus autem concilii acta fideliter ex *Armenis* codicibus descripsit idem *Galanus*, apud quem ex codicibus illius gentis conciliorum, & epistolarum, idem testimonium legitur pag. 436. & 478. Hinc constat hoc comma B. *Johannis* verbis additum jam ante seculi decimi quarti initia, in codices *Armenicos* irrepsisse. Nunc inquirendum est quibus de causis, & quâ ratione, hoc factum sit.

Certum est Reges *Armenorum*, qui in *Cilicia* regni sui sedem XIII seculo habuerunt, ad communionem, & conjunctionem cum ecclesiâ *Latinorum* accessisse, ipsumque episcopum *Romanum* veneratos ut primum patriarcham, & ecclesiarum suarum caput. Jam inter eos celeberrimus fuit Rex

Rex *Hethum*, quem illius ætatis *Latini* Scriptores *Haitbonem* appellant. Is, teste *Haitbone Armeno*, ejus consanguineo & cognomine, cap. XIII. Historiæ orientalis ab eodē ditæ, per quadraginta quinque annos *Armenia* regnum tenuit, ab anno nimirum Domini MCCXXIV. & diem suum obiit MCCLXX, postquam sub finem vitæ suæ Fratrum Minorum seu *Franciscanorum* ordini nomen dedisset. Vixit perpetuò conjunctus cum ecclesiâ *Romana*, linguæ etiam *Latina* satis peritus pro captu illius ævi. Biblia sua *Armenica* exegit ad *Latinam* versionem vulgatam, quam ita diligenter expressit, ut ipsas *Hieronymi* præfationes, & prologum Galeatum, in linguam *Armenicam* converterit, quæ præfationes, in editione *Uscani Amstelodamensi* extant, & in *Constantinopolitana* anni MDCCV. Suppressit ergo hæc *Haitbonis* editio cæteras omnes, ita ut si quis *Armenicos* codices accuratos requirat, ei excurrendum sit in *Armeniam* usque ad exquirenda exemplaria quorum antiquitas supra decimum tertium seculum adsurgat. Cum autem constat *Latinos* codices illius ævi comma illud epistolæ Divi *Jobannis* habuisse, nihil mirum videbitur si nunc ab *Haitbone* in codices suos translatus, constanter in omnibus *Armenicis* editionibus legatur. Longè plura hic addere possem, nisi tædium subreperet, & vererer ne te meâ loquacitate offenderem. Itaque vale, & amare perge

Tui studiosissimum,

M. V. La Croze.

Dab. Berolini XVI.

Cal. Sept. 1733.

Most honoured and very reverend Sir,

HOW it came about that my letter concerning the verse of St. *John* the Apostle has been heard of in *England*, I know not; for I had taken no great pains in it, it being wrote off hand at a time when I was not very well either in body or mind. Indeed I fate down to the writing it with a kind of unwilling consent; but I could not deny it to the importunity of a friend, especially as I did not imagine it would go any farther, I cannot gratify your desire of giving you a copy of that letter, since I seldom or never keep copies of my letters by me, but shall acquaint you with all I can remember of that affair, and shall add some other things as they occur to me, which I beg you will take in good part.

It never was my intention to enter into this dispute. I knew full well by experience how dangerous a matter it is, when inconsiderate and injudicious men will be ready to call in question the Christianity of those, who do not, as they think, pay sufficient regard to their sentiments, how rashly soever embraced by them. I shall notwithstanding speak the real thoughts of my heart. * I am ready to hazard life itself for that most certain

* The Author of this letter cannot be too much commended for his courage and integrity in withstanding these unjust and violent reproaches, which in former times appear to have had too great an influence on learned and worthy men to the great obscuring of the truth. Thus *Erasmus*, tho' in his two first editions of the N. T. he omitted this text, was for that reason suspected to be an Arian, and so abused and reflected on, that not daring to omit it again, he inserted it in a new edition, *for fear*, as he tells us, *of giving an handle for reproach, nè ansa fit calumniandi*; and this contrary to the authority of all his manuscripts, (as *F. Simon* says, who censures him for it *Crit. Hist. N. T. cap. 18.*) only from a copy he had heard of in *England*, which himself suspected to be alter'd.—Nor is it unlikely that this was the case with

Robert

certain doctrine of the divinity of our Lord *Jesus Christ* and other points deduced from it by our Divines, but never could think that this doctrine (which may be clearly demonstrated from many authorities in the New Testament,) was possible to be maintained by doubtful, uncertain, and I may add, *false* arguments, without the utmost danger of the truth itself. . . . But it is time to come nearer to the matter in hand.

The arguments which chiefly induce me to be of that opinion, which I now defend, are these, namely, the silence of the antient Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, and also the authority of the old versions, which deserve no small regard. As

T 3

for

Robert Stephens, who in his first editions inclosed the whole passage within crotchets, as wanting in his manuscripts, but these editions drew on him the heavy censures of the clergy at *Lowain*, and at *Paris*, who presented several petitions to *K. Henry* the 2d against them, and never rested till they had prevail'd with that Prince to put them in the number of prohibited books: No wonder therefore if he, fearful to place the marks aright so as to denote the whole passage to be wanting, should chuse rather in his subsequent editions politically to misplace them, as if only the words *ἐν τῷ ὑπανω* were wanting, and so let it pass (with such as should examine it) as the error of the press; being more willing to incur the censure of *incorrectness*, than the more dangerous one of *heterodoxy*. *F. Simon's* Crit. Hist. N. T. Part 2. cap. 11.—This seems to be somewhat the case of *Dr. Mill* also, who having stated the evidence very fairly and fully, draws a conclusion quite contrary to his premises in favour of the text; but *this*, says *Mr. Le Clerc*, Pref. to *Kuster's* edition, is not to be ascribed to a defect of his judgment, but to the fear of offending a set of men, who are wont to brand all such, as speak the truth freely, with those heresies, which they chuse not to argue against from corrupted passages. *Mr. Martin* himself seems to be one of this set of men, for while he wishes that this opinion, viz of this text not being genuine, had been confin'd to the new sect of the *Arians*, or the *Socinians*, and complains, that it had found favour with some Christians, who were willing enough to retain the doctrine of the Trinity, but yet rejected this passage, he immediately insinuates, that those Christians were among the secret adversaries of that doctrine. *Critical Dissertat.* p. 4.

for manuscript copies I think there is nothing to be said, since it is notorious, that the only *Greek* manuscript in our library, to which they appeal, is transcribed from the *Complutensian* edition, in an hand plainly modern, as I have very often proved both to strangers who have come hither, and also to our own countrymen, and am still ready to prove to any one. Whatever faults have thro the negligence of the printers crept into the *Complutensian* edition, the very same are read in our manuscript copy without any variation, even the letters are formed and shaped after those in that edition; besides the parchment is quite new, and the ink of a pale colour, purposely made use of to counterfeit the look of antiquity and to deceive the unwary, so that it appears most evidently to me, that this manuscript copy was forged by some wicked sordid fellow with a view to chouse the purchaser of a large sum of money, in which he succeeded to his wish.

I have no better opinion of the *Dublin* copy, which I observed to be very modern from the very shape of the letters as they are cursorily described in a certain journal, the name whereof I do not recollect, nor have I the book by me. That copy also reads *τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυρῆντες ἐν τῇ γῆ*, in like manner as the *Greek* version of the *Lateran* Council, where the words of the *vulgate* version are *in terrâ*, the *Greek* is there expressed in a *Latin* phrase contrary to the usual phrase of the *N. T.* which generally uses *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*: from whence one may venture to affirm that those words crept into the later *Greek* editions from that version of the *Lateran* council *.

Much

* This observation is very strong, *ἐν τῇ γῇ* being no proper *Greek* phrase for *on earth*, but *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. The former is not, as I can find, ever once used in the *New Testament* in.

Much more might be said on so copious an argument, but that I remember I am writing an epistle and not a dissertation; therefore after adding a few things about the consent and authority of the Fathers, I shall proceed to the matter in dispute between me and the learned *Bencelius*, who is now preparing an edition of the New Testament.

What chiefly prevailed with me to depart from my former opinion is the silence of *Athanasius*, who

in that signification, unless *Luke* 12. 51. be counted an exception, *ἰσχυρὴν δέουσαν ἐν τῇ γῇ* to give peace on earth, or among the people of the earth; which has plainly a different meaning and construction, not denoting the place where he was, or acted, or gave, &c. but the place, or rather the persons, to whom he gave peace. As to *Rev.* 5. 13. *ἐν τῇ γῇ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης*, it is a manifest transposition of the *ἐν* and the *ἐπὶ*, and accordingly the best and greater number of the copies read in that place *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ*. Where indeed by *in the earth* is meant *in or under the ground*: the usual phrase is, *ἐν τῇ γῇ*, as in *Mat.* 25. 18. *be digged in the earth*, *ὤρυξεν ἐν τῇ γῇ*, and *v.* 25. *be hid his talent in the earth*, *ἐκρύφα ἐν τῇ γῇ*: or where any particular land or country is intended, as *1 King.* 10. 11. *ἐν τῇ γῇ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ*, in the land of Galilee; and in *John* 17. 4. *Mat.* 2. 5. *Bethlehem* is said to be *ἐν γῇ Ἰούδα*, in the land of Judah: But where *on or upon* [the material] earth is meant, as the place where the person is or acts, especially when by way of antithesis (as in this disputed text) to *heaven*, it is constantly expressed both in the Septuagint and in the N. T. by *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. Thus *Deut.* 12. 1. *These are the statutes ye shall observe in the land*, *ἐν τῇ γῇ*, which the Lord giveth you all the days ye shall live on the earth, *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*; and *1 Cor.* 8. 5. *ἢ ἐν ἐβραϊσμῷ, ἢ ἐν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, whether in heaven or on earth. *Heb.* 12. 25. *τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, him that spake on earth, is put in opposition to *τὸν ἀπὸ ἐβραϊσμοῦ*, him that speaketh from heaven: and in the Lord's-prayer, *thy will be done, ὡς ἐν ἐβραϊσμῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, *Rev.* 3. 10. as in heaven so also on earth; and in numberless other places, some of which are cited in the margin ||.

Well therefore might *Erasmus* say of the British manuscript, which he was informed read those words, *Hunc suspicor ad Latinorum codices fuisse castigatum*, I suspect this manuscript to have been corrected after the Latin ones. See his Apology against *Stunica* and his Annotations on the New Testament.

So likewise *F. Simon* supposes it to be taken, tho not directly from the Latin, yet from the Greek translation of the council of

Lateran,

who never appeal'd to that verse of *St. John*, which yet would have been of great service to him, if it had been found in the copies of his time. That which is objected by some, and was particularly urged to me at her Majesty's table by two Divines of our communion, that neither doth the said *Athanasius* ever quote the passage, which relates to the form of administering baptism, proceeds from a shameful ignorance, which I am not now at leisure to expose; for that passage so often occurs in *Athanasius*, that I wonder how any could be so stupid to make that objection. But that I may not seem to advance any thing without ground,

Lateran, and thinks the phrase *ἵνα ὁ βαπτισμὸς* is a Latinism, translated from the *Latin* words *in tres*. It is true, Mr. *Martin*, Dissert. p. 74. instances in several differences between them to show that it could not be taken from the *Greek* of that council. But in the *Dublin* manuscript there are no such differences, for that manuscript not only has the words *ἐν τριῶν*, which shows it to be a translation from the *Latin*, but the very order of the words is the same with the *Greek* version of the *Lateran* council, *ἐν τριῶν ὁ βαπτισμὸς* and not *ὁ βαπτισμὸς ἐν τριῶν*, as in the other copies; besides which the same Mr. *Martin* observes, *La verite du Texte*, p. 298. that the abbreviations, tho' very particular, are exactly the same in both, which is a plain proof that the *Dublin* manuscript is a transcript from that version, and therefore cannot be older, tho' it is probably much later, than the thirteenth century, when that council was held.

The true state of this text seems in short to be this, not being wrote by *St. John*, it was not in any antient *Greek* manuscript or version, nor known to any of the antient Fathers; but being *St. Cyprian's* interpretation of the eighth verse, it was either by *St. Cyprian* himself, or some of his admirers wrote into the margin of a *Latin* manuscript, (which was a very common practice. See *F. Simon's* Crit. Hist. N. T. part 2. c. 18.) and from thence in process of time slid into the body of the text, and thus got into some few (but not into the generality of) *Latin* copies, possibly as old as the time of *Viktor Vitenfis* about the end of the fifth century, and from these *Latin* copies, or citations thence, was afterwards translated and transcribed into the more modern *Greek* ones; hence it is accounted for, why it is wanting in all the antient *Greek* manuscripts and versions, and not cited by the primitive writers, why it appears earlier in the *Latin* than in the *Greek* manuscripts, and how it came at last into the *Greek* ones of modern date, and in a *Latin* phraseology.

Zeger.
Castigat.
in N. T.
ad hunc
locum.

ground, I shall refer these men to the very places of *Athanasius*, which I have met with in his genuine works. I make use of the late *Paris* edition, where there is a passage to this purpose p. 237. b. and again p. 239. a. b. and in his oration against the *Arians* p. 479. a. b. and in his second oration against the same *Arians* p. 508. d. f. and p. 509. a. b. These I think are sufficient, for I have noted above ten other places which I forbear to quote. I mean not however to accuse these objectors of dishonesty, but only of rashness and gross ignorance. Besides, let any one attend to the commentary of *Oecumenius* on the epistle of St. *John*, where the whole text is extant without that verse, which consequently is not mention'd in the commentary, and if he be not greatly byass'd by prejudice, he will be obliged to be of my opinion, whether he will or no. The very learned Dr. *Mill* in his notes on the first epistle of *John* hath faithfully collected a great many more arguments, altho' for trifling reasons he seems to favour the other opinion. But into this let others inquire that will, for my part I have done more than I could well expect, considering my infirm state of health and weak eyes.

It remains only that I should say something in relation to the *Armenian* version, which hath this verse in the editions of Bishop *Uscan*. I was inclinable to think that this verse was added by him from the vulgate version, since he acknowledges in his preface, that he had taken some other things from that version. He altered nothing indeed in the *Armenian* text itself, but added many things from the *Latin* version, as is easy to be observed by any one who compares the *Armenian* and *Latin* together. But what induced me to be of another opinion was the authority of the council of *Sinis* in the year of our Lord 1307 in *Cilicia*, which

which was then called *Armenia* the less, p. 462, in *Galanus* p. 461. The acts of this council have been faithfully copied by the said *Galanus* from the *Armenian* books, in whom p. 436 and p. 478. we find the same testimony taken from the books of the councils and letters of that nation. Hence it appears that this addition to St. *John's* words was got into the *Armenian* manuscripts before the beginning of the fourteenth century ‖. I am now therefore to examine by what means this was done.

Certain it is that the Kings of *Armenia*, who had their residence in *Cilicia* in the thirteenth century, came over to the communion of the *Latin* Church, and united themselves to it, and even respected the bishop of *Rome* as their chief Patriarch and head of their churches. Among these the most famous was King *Hesbum*, whom the *Latin* writers of that age call *Haitbon*. This King, according to the testimony of *Haitbon* the *Armenian*, his kinsman and name-sake, in the 13th chapter of his *Oriental History*, possessed the throne of *Armenia* for forty five years, viz. from the year of our Lord 1224. He died in the year 1270, having towards the latter part of his life entered himself into the order of the Friars Minor or *Franciscans*. He lived all along in close union with the church of *Rome*, and was well skill'd in the *Latin* tongue for that age. He corrected his *Armenian* bibles by the vulgate *Latin* version, which he has so exactly followed, that he translated *Jerom's* prefaces and *Prologus Galeatus* into the *Armenian* tongue, which prefaces are inserted in the *Amsterdam* edition of *Uscan*, and

‖ But that it was not in the more antient *Armenian* manuscripts, appears from what the learned *Sandius* testifies, that in an *Armenian* copy above 400 years old, shewn to him by the *Armenian* bishop at *Amsterdam*, this text was wanting, as he himself saw. See *Sand. paradox.* p. 376.

and also in the *Constantinopolitan* edition of 1705. By means of this edition of *Haitbon* all others were suppressed, so that whoever would find an accurate *Armenian* copy must go as far as *Armenia* to search for copies, which are older than the thirteenth century. Seeing therefore it is certain, that the *Latin* copies of that age had this verse in the epistle of St. *John*, it is not to be wondered at, that being at this time translated by *Haitbon* into his copies, it should be constantly found in all the *Armenian* editions.

I might add a great deal more, but that I grow tired myself, and fear I should be too tedious to you also; therefore bid you farewell, and desire the continuance of your friendship to

Your affectionate

M. V. La Croze.

August 17, 1733.



Dr.

and also in the Constantine edition of 1550.
 By means of this edition of Constantine all others were
 superseded, so that whoever would find an accu-
 rate Hebrew copy must go as far as Constantine to
 search for copies, which are older than the tri-
 nity copy. Seeing therefore it is certain
 that the Latin copies of that age had this verse in
 the eighth of St. Job, it is not to be wondered
 at that being at this time translated by Blauden
 into his copies, it should be constantly found in all
 the Christian editions.

I might add a great deal more, but that I
 grow tired myself, and fear I should be too re-
 mote to you also; therefore bid you farewell,
 and desire the continuance of your friendship to

your affectionate

M. V. La Croix.

Aug 17 1733



Dr. BENNET's *New Theory of*
the Trinity Examined:

OR, SOME

CONSIDERATIONS

ON HIS

DISCOURSE of the Ever-
blessed Trinity in Unity;

HANDLED

His Examination of Dr. CLARKE'S
Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity.

*Egregiè Aristoteles ait, nunquam nos verecundiores
esse debere, quàm cum de Diis agitur—quanto
magis—cum de Deorum Naturâ disputamus,
ne quid temerè, ne quid impudenter, aut igno-
rantes affirmemus, aut scientes mentiamur?*

Sen. Nat. Quæst. l. 7. c. 30.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

Texts and arguments, usually urged in this controversy on the Trinitarian side, given up by the Doctor, as having no force in them.

CHAP. II.

The Doctor's new notion of the Quiescence of the Word examin'd.

CHAP. III.

The force of those texts, which are relied on by the Doctor, consider'd.

APPENDIX relating to the Deity of the Holy Ghost.

CHAP. IV.

Some general Observations on the Doctor's New Scheme.



INTRODUCTION.

IT would be something strange, if this book, of so famed an author as Dr. Bennet; a book of so long expectation, and so deliberate a birth; on so important a subject as the *Holy Trinity*, and against so celebrated a writer and eminent Divine as Dr. Clarke; should pass in the world without any notice. One great question, I find, has been, from which quarter an *Answer* would first come; whether from those *against whom*, or from those *for whom* 'tis pretended to be written. I who know not the intentions of any other in this matter, do adventure to give freely my own thoughts of his performance, which, I confess, contains in it something new.

For, tho the *subject* of the *Holy Trinity*, and the *Divinity of our blessed Saviour*, has' with sufficient boldness been teaz'd and tortured by the schoolmen, and wrought into great variety of fine schemes; yet, it seems, something has been left for the *scholastic genius* of Dr. Bennet to supply: and still, I apprehend, none of 'em all will satisfy; and no wonder! For,

Tho it may not be hard to understand what we find of these subjects in the *Scriptures* themselves; yet, when men think they must adjust the Scripture-accounts to obscure *ecclesiastical terms* and *phrases*, which lie very cross thereto, this requires a busy invention to find out, or handsomely to frame some scheme, that may at least seem to take in both the *Scriptures*, and the prevailing *ecclesiastical* notions: and if *these* can never kindly agree to the satisfaction of sober *Christians*, then they must try *another* scheme, and so on unto weariness;

weariness; till men can learn the wisdom to be content with the plain *antient creeds*, and leave out all the *modern* inconsistent additions, that give them so much trouble.

Christianity, or *Christ crucified*, was originally
 1 Cor. 1. a doctrine of great simplicity; but to the Greeks
 23. *this was foolishness*. Those grand *Sophists* and in-
 quisitive *disputers of the age*, required something
 more profound and sublime, some towering spe-
 culations, and puzzling metaphysics, with pom-
 pous words and dress, which might be above the
 vulgar understanding, and give the men of phi-
 losophy an opportunity to shew their distinguish'd
 genius in unravelling and explaining them. But
that Jesus of Nazareth, whom God anointed with
the Holy Spirit, to go about to do good, was cru-
cify'd for our sins, and rose again; thro' whom we
have access to the Father, by one Spirit; this was
 such a plain unaffected narrative, that they could
 not easily make it serve their pride and vanity.
 This, alas is a Gospel the *Poor* may understand;
 and let them receive it! but the haughtiness of
 the *Philosopher* affected something more abstruse
 and mysterious.

So that it must be observ'd, the *pride of reason*,
 which hinder'd these men from believing in Christ,
 did not lie *so much* in refusing to submit their
 faith to *mysterious* speculations, which puzzled
 their reason; as, on the contrary, in a proud af-
 fection of swelling words and philosophic my-
 steries, and in not humbling their understandings
 to receive a plain Gospel, and familiar doctrine*:

which,
 * I own they rejected the doctrine of the resurrection of the
 dead; but find not, that this was ever imputed to the pride of
 reason, but 'twas on another account, because they judg'd the
 body to be so base and vile, the prison and punishment of the
 mind, that it was unworthy of God to restore it again.
 The *resurrection* was not unintelligible in the *notion* of it,
 (as *three persons* in one God, or *one single He is*) only the *modus*
 was

which, instead of subtle abstracted *speculations*, affords indeed a wonderful *mystery*, but of *practical* influence, to excite love, gratitude, and devout obedience, viz. a *mystery* of the great loving-kindness of God, in not sparing his own Son, and of the *unsearchable riches of grace* in Jesus Christ, in humbling himself so low, in life and death, on so compassionate a design, as the salvation of miserable sinners: this is the *mystery* the *Apostles* magnify and recommend to Christians, which the *Poor* may understand and improve; and not a *mystery* of unintelligible words, of philosophical paradoxes; nor of essences, and consubstantial *hypostases*, *circum-incessions* and *communication of idioms*, &c. Too much of this came in, when the pride of philosophy made men ashamed of the primitive simplicity of the Gospel. How far the Author of the *book* I have under examination, has contributed his endeavour to recover this primitive simplicity, I leave the reader to judge: while yet I can truly esteem, and respect him, for his valuable abilities, for his industrious application of mind to an examination and inquiry into the important matters of our Christian religion; and for divers other worthy qualities, viz.

1. Particularly for his civility and candor towards his adversary, whom he has opposed in an amicable calm manner; not with rude reproaches, and persecuting fury, but with a great deal of *good temper*, and *good manners*: and if a few smart censures are dropt, now and then, they are laid on softly and tenderly, as with a friendly hand.

VOL. II. *U. B. A.*
 was so, which is no Christian doctrine at all, (as *Trinitarians* pretend their *subsistencies* and *procession* to be) but the thing itself was a plain familiar matter, and the meaning easy to be understood, tho' not how to be effected; the fact might seem incredible, but the notion was not inconsistent nor contradictory: Besides, this was not what they despised, as weakness and foolishness, but Christ crucified. This is a sufficient answer to what Dr. Waterland objects. Defence p. 325. T. R.

I know indeed he opposed one, whose great abilities, and well-known excellencies are such, that no man, with any good grace, could have treated him with either anger or scorn: but still I believe better of Dr. Bennet's disposition, than to think he had any Inclination to it.

2. For his resolute contempt of those *false* topics of persuasion, by which ignorant and degenerate minds are led captive into error, or lose the praise of it if it, should be into truth; viz. all *human* decisions by *councils* or *churches* authority, when their judgment is not agreeable to the holy Scriptures. In this case he has asserted the true Christian liberty of judging for himself, and opposing others; and speaks as if he had the courage and honesty to oppose the most triumphant errors of his age. He is so sensible of the attractive charms of truth, that let her be called *Sabellian* or *Socinian*, or by any ugly name whatever, it shall not affright him from being her open advocate. And indeed, *her price is far above that of rubies, and happy is the man, that findeth her.*

Pro. 2.
13, 15.

P. 4.

3. For his zealous profession of integrity, exciting others to act honestly and openly, according to their judgments; and not to use arts of disguise and hypocrisy in sacred matters; for so I understand him in those excellent words, *Whatever little ends may be served in this world by artifice, shift and collusion; yet nothing, but the most unbiass'd integrity in our conduct here, can prevent our everlasting disgrace hereafter.*

In these things I greatly praise him, as worthy of imitation. And if I cannot so much commend his *notions*, as worthy to be receiv'd by Christians; I hope the following discourse will evince that it is for this good reason, viz. That they are the result of *imagination*, more than of *evidence*.



A N

EXAMINATION

Of the Reverend

Dr. BENNET's *New Theory*.

I Propose four things in relation to Dr. Benner's book.

- I. To shew what texts of Scripture he discharges from that hard service against the *Arians* and *Socinians*, which so many have long and unjustly press'd them into.
- II. To examine his new notion of the *Quiescence* of the WORD, which he supposes to be distinct from Christ's rational Soul, and by which he thinks to answer some texts and arguments, which are urged against the supreme self-existent Deity of Jesus Christ.
- III. To consider the strength of those few remaining texts, which he has reserv'd as his only defence in this cause: to which I have added an *Appendix* concerning the *Deity of the Holy Ghost*.
- IV. To make some general observations upon his new *Theory*, and scheme of the *Trinity in Unity*, as containing very great absurdities.

U 2

C H A P.

C H A P. I.

Texts given up by the Doctor.

P. 21.

I Begin with a brief representation of those texts and arguments upon them, which the Doctor owns have no force in them to prove the supreme Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, after all the stir which some have made about them; *Whilst they have been afraid to part with any one argument, that has been urged in favour of orthodoxy by their predecessors in controversy.*

As for that remarkable text, *Phil. 2. 6. Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God*; he spends his whole seventh chapter in an elaborate and judicious confutation of those, who interpret this of Christ's divine nature; and frankly concludes, that St. Paul is so far from teaching (in this remarkable passage) that the Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ is inferior to the very God, that he does not, therein, speak one syllable of his Divine Nature, but only of his Human Nature. So that being in the form of God, and equal to God, he allows, may and must agree to Christ's human nature only.

In the next chapter, he throws up, at once, all the arguments taken from the Gospel-history of our Saviour's life, actions, and doctrine; with a professed design to prove *this proposition, viz. That during the time of our Saviour's ministry the Disciples did not believe he was any thing more than a mere man, conducted and assisted by the Spirit of God*: and tells us, pag. 94. That as there is not in all the New Testament one passage, which implies the Disciples believed him to have had any Divine Nature during his ministry;

so 'tis very remarkable, (says the Doctor) that the whole course of our Saviour's wonderful actions affords no proof, nor even the smallest intimation of his having any Divine Nature at all, viz.

1. Not his knowing the thoughts of mens hearts; and therefore he answers to such texts, as *John* 2. 24, 25. *John* 16. 3. and such like expressions.

2. Nor his miracles, casting out devils, and raising the dead; since the Disciples did the very same things in every kind; as he says pag. 101.

3. Nor his taking on him to forgive sins, *Mat.* 9. 2, 5. which he grants a mere man may do, if God pleases, whatever the Jews pretended against it.

4. Nor his conferring on others a power to work miracles: *Mat.* 10. 1.

Next, he goes on to consider what things our Lord said of himself, which many take to be proofs of his Divine Nature given to his Disciples; but indeed were not so, viz.

1. Not his saying he came down from heaven.

2. Nor his having glory with the Father before the world was, *John* 17. 5.

3. Nor his calling himself the only-begotten Son of God, *John* 5. 16, 18. which he says did not discover that he had any Divine Nature at all, pag. 109. being only on the account of his being man, pag. 162.

4. Nor his saying, *I and my Father are one*, *John* 10. 30. the same phrase expressing the union between Christ and his Disciples.

5. Nor in saying, *As the Father knoweth me, so I know the Father*; *John* 10. 15.

6. Nor in those words, *John* 14. 7—11. *He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.*

7. Nor in those, *John* 5. 19. *Whatsoever things the Father doth, these also doth the Son.*

U. 3

8. Nor

8. Nor in saying, he was *greater than the Temple*, Mat. 12. 6.

9. Nor that he was *Lord of the Sabbath*, ver. 8.

10. Nor in saying, he *had life in himself*, even as the Father hath; John 5. 26.

11. Or that all things, *that the Father hath, are mine*; John 16. 15.

12. Nor in saying, that he *should raise the dead at the day of judgment*, John 6. 40.

Of all these declarations the Doctor says, they might have been strictly true, and might have been made by him, tho he had been nothing more than a mere man, conducted and assisted by God's Spirit, p. 116. So that for any thing argued from these texts, the Doctor plainly implies, he might not have had any divine nature personally united to his manhood at all.

In like manner he grants, that John 3. 31. where the Baptist says of Jesus, *He is above all*; and those words, John 1. 18. *The only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father*; and those, John 5. 17. where he calls God, *ιδιον ωρισπα*, (whence the Jews falsely inferred, that he made himself equal to God) are all applicable to his human nature, and so is the character of the image of God, and the *first-born of the creation*, Col. 1. 15. See pag. 170. The same he says pag. 173. of those expressions, the *heir of all things*, the *brightness of his Father's glory*, and the *express image of his person*, or substance; Heb. 1. 2.

Of all Christ's declarations during his ministry, the Doctor reserves to himself only these three texts, John 5. 22, 23. *foretelling*, he says, his *receiving of religious worship*; Mat. 18. 20. *foretelling his presence with his Disciples after his ascension*:

son: and lastly, John 14. 13, 14. assuring them he would answer their prayers. He grants that these (and perhaps there may be others such) did hint and imply our Lord's having a divine nature; but then it is because he supposes this mystery revealed to us other ways: and so the meaning of those declarations becomes clear to them, who believe it before-hand, for other reasons, and bring that pre-conceiv'd meaning with them to the text. But he does not think the Disciples took the *asarsaid bints*. Nay, on the contrary, he says, our Lord's having a divine nature, was what they least suspected, and would have been most shock'd at. P. 117. P. 118.

I may add several other common topics which he recedes from, viz. from Christ's raising himself when dead, which he allows to be done by the human Soul, pag. 149. So from his judging the world, which the Disciples knew of, and yet little thought of his having any divine nature, pag. 155. and from his being an object of religious worship, pag. 29. and lastly, from the form of baptism, where the Son betokens (he says p. 211.) the man Christ. And now from hence I only infer two things:

(1.) That without believing or suspecting any divine nature in the Lord Jesus Christ we may have such a faith as was acceptable in the Disciples, even such faith as that for which our Saviour pronounced St. Peter blessed, telling him he had that right knowledge of him the Son, which flesh and blood had not reveal'd, but was the particular favour of God to him; and that unless we have higher and clearer evidence of his having a divine nature, than they, who knew him and conversed so long and intimately with him, then had, we are as excusable in not believing it, as they were. Mat. 16. 17.

P. 211.

(2.) I infer, that 'tis not the baptismal-Creed or Trinity, that the Doctor contends for against Dr. Clarke, or others; for he acknowledges with them, that in the form of baptism, (*viz. into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*) the *Father*, or first of that Trinity, implies all that is the one self-existent God, (who is usually styled *the Father*, and never is said to be the Father of the *Word*, or of any person in the divine Nature;) that the *Son* betokens the *Man Christ*, a being distinct from the very God: and that thus the *Father*, and the *Son*, signify thro the whole Gospel. I see then no disagreement in the Doctor with *Arians*, at least not with *Socinians*; their baptismal Trinity (which our Creeds are built upon) and his, is just the same: he indeed imagines another interior Trinity in the *Father*, or *First* of this Trinity; and may, if he pleas's, another, in the first of that again, and so have a Trinity of Trinities: but the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, into which Trinity we are baptized, are, I find, not the matter of dispute with him; and yet I dare say, most people thought the controversy lay there; and that if there be another Trinity in the *Father*, and if the *Word* be one in it, yet we are not baptized into that interior Trinity, since no notice is taken of it there. And as the honest Christian may be easy and glad to find this point agreed, so I presume, that as the Doctor hath granted his adversaries this baptismal Trinity, they, in return, shall not oppose his philosophical Trinity of modes, or powers, and operations, in the *Father*, if he will not impose it on them as the Scripture-Trinity. Let me then bespeak both sides in *Moses's* courteous words, *Ye are brethren, why do ye wrong one to another?*

Let none think I intend, by this enumeration of the texts by him freely surrender'd to the
adver-

adversaries, in the least to upbraid him with any design to betray the Trinitarian cause; for whatever be the real consequence, I am well satisfy'd of his hearty zeal to defend it: but he has too much sagacity to be imposed on by texts unnaturally apply'd to the proof of Christ's supreme Deity, which he judges will prove just the contrary; and was constrained to throw them up, and glad to get rid of them, by interpreting them of Christ's human *pre-existing* soul: tho I remember, the late Dr. Sberlock (writing against the late Bishop of Gloucester, who had made the like interpretation) says, he had given away *most of the principal proofs* of our Saviour's Deity.

CH A P. II.

The new notion of the quiescence of the Word examin'd.

I AM next to examine the Doctor's new notion of the *quiescence* of the WORD, *Ch. 9.* by which he thinks to answer some texts and arguments, which are urged against the supreme Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and without which he acknowledges they cannot be answered; and insinuates this for a proof of the truth of his notion, *pag. 128.*

His notion of the quiescence of the WORD is this, That the *Word* (who personally united to P. 125. the man Christ Jesus) *did not communicate any extraordinary influence to him, more than to other mortals; i. e.* no more than if there had been no such union at all: insomuch, that none of his Disciples could perceive any sign of such a personal union, from any thing he did or said, during his whole ministry, till after his resurrection; but that he was wholly under the conduct of the Holy

Holy Spirit. By this he hopes to defend himself against some texts urged by his adversaries; particularly that of the Son's not *knowing the day of judgment*: and indeed against all the great prejudices, that must needs be raised against the doctrine of our Lord's supreme Deity from the non-appearance, or no evidence of it, in the whole course of his life and doctrine. To this he answers, true; but tho his divine nature did not appear, yet it was united to him, only it lay as still and silent as if not so; and because his opposers will say, this is but a pretence, and that if there was such an union, it would not be without some suitable effects, or to no purpose; therefore he labours to constrain them too, on their own principles, to admit this quiescence of the *Word*, in their notion of it.

In the first place he takes it for a certain truth, that our Lord Jesus had two intelligent natures in him united to his body, otherwise, if there be but *one*, he has proved that cannot be the self-existent God, but pre-existent Soul. He knows this touches not at all the *Socinians*, who assert but one intelligent Being in our *Saviour's* person; nor much those *Arians*, who suppose the *WORD* to be the Soul of Christ, or the Soul to be the Word: nor do I find that Dr. *Clarke* has ever said, they are two distinct Beings, tho he would fain urge it upon him, as well as on the *Arians*, that they must grant it (as a consequence of the high character they give the *Logos* or Word) that it cannot be the Soul of the Man Christ Jesus, if he was a man in such sense as other men are. But without inquiry into the philosophical notion of a man, whether any rational spirit united and limited to, and sympathizing with such an organized body as ours, does not truly become a man, or be of another *Species*;

I think his way of reasoning does not make out the consequence pretended in his third chapter. For as the Doctor cannot prove against 'em by any direct testimony, that the *Word* and rational Soul are two; any more than that *Jesus* and *Christ* denote two persons; so neither does his reasoning extort an acknowledgment of it from themselves, as he imagines.

His main, if not his whole argument for this, is, That Dr. Clarke, and also the *Arians*, allow the *Word* to be superior to all created Beings whatever, and that all were made by him; and they call it a *divine nature*. But what then? Is not the Man Christ *Jesus*, according to the Doctor's own assertions, superior to all created beings whatever, having all power in heaven and earth given to him? Does he not tell us, That the P. 171.
Man Christ Jesus is the first-born of all the creation? 1. Because his Soul was created before all other creatures. 2. Because he is now in possession of the *Jus primogeniti* (or right of primogeniture) which the *divine nature* is incapable of receiving, being the governor of all created beings, and God's vicegerent; and that the whole creation P. 173.
 is at his command. These things, he says, must, or most fairly may be understood of his human nature only; with many more such high characters of the Man (or human Soul of) Christ. Now I appeal to any one, if this be not as high and lofty as any thing said by the *Arians* of the *Word*; at least that need be said by 'em in maintenance of their great article. They don't make him in power and honour superior to all creatures, in a greater degree than the Doctor makes Christ's human Soul now to be; and therefore 'tis no argument against the *Word's* being a spirit of the same kind, in that he was thus superior, as one of

of the same kind now is. That mind which has such transcendent glories now, surely was naturally as capable of great glory before: and he who is now God's Minister (or Vicegerent, as he often terms the man Christ Jesus) in governing and judging the whole creation, was as capable, for ought that he has said, to be a subordinate minister in the formation of it. And that human soul (rather mind) which, in its separation from the body of Christ, he grants, *might be endued* (pag. 149.) with a miraculous power of raising himself from the dead, as well as he had before raised others, might, I conceive, by the like divine power, raise the first *Adam* out of the dust also into life: And, I think, to give life is the noblest part of the creation. But yet neither this nor the other does necessarily give one the dominion, or make him God, over them, whom he has ministerially raised, since the Apostles were without this dominion.

P. 15. The Doctor indeed pretends the Word, or the rational Spirit, thro which, according to his opposers, all things were formed, must be *essentially superior* to all; and that the *power and wisdom* manifested in the creation, must be *essential to the Great Architect of the universe*. To which I answer, most certainly infinite power and wisdom are essential to the *Great Architect*, and Master-Builder, or Creator of the world; even to the God and Father of our Lord *Jesus*, and of all things else. But as I know not, that either *Arians*, or any primitive Christian writers, ever adventured to give the character of THE GREAT ARCHITECT of the universe to *Jesus Christ* *, chusing rather, with the sacred writings, John. 1. 3. to say in softer language, that *thro him &c. all things were made* God

* See Vol. I. p. 199.

God created all things *, reserving the *absolute* title of *The Creator of the Universe* to another, viz. the God and Father of the *Word*: so I see not, that the *essential native* power either of miracles, or creation, (which are much the same) is at all requisite in such *subordinate* ministers, who do all by a *communicated power* from him who acts by them. 'Tis enough that this fulness is in the

* This Dr. Waterland, Def. p. 188. very unjustly and very untruly calls a *misrepresentation of the sacred writings*; for, says he, *they do not constantly follow that soft language*, and then instances in *John* 1. 3, 10. *Colos.* 1. 16. *Heb.* 1. 10. to the contrary, whereas in none of those places are all things said to be created *ὕπ' αὐτοῦ* by him, as the *efficient cause*, but all, except the last, are expressly in the language mentioned by our author *ἐν* or *δι' αὐτοῦ*, *through him*, as the *instrumental cause*. And as to *Heb.* 1. 10. the Doctor has not been able to prove it to be spoke of Christ at all, altho he well knew that our Author (as well as several others) understand it of God the Father according to the original meaning in *Psalms* 102. from whence it is quoted. See this Tract cap. 3, *sub fine*. There was no ground therefore for that reflexion on our Author, Def. p. 187. *That he had expressed himself in such a manner, as may deceive ignorant and unwary readers*. This reflexion may with much more justice be retorted on himself, when he says, "A man must be a very stranger to the Antients, who can make any question whether they attributed the work of creation to the Son, as much as to the Father." True indeed so he must, if he does not know, that they unquestionably made a mighty difference between them. Nay the Doctor himself was so aware of it, that he is forced to say and unsay, "They ascribed it equally, says he, to both, only with this difference, that for the greater majesty and dignity of the Father, as the first person, they supposed him to issue out orders, or to give his fiat for the Creation, and the Son to execute?" That is, they ascribed it equally to both, only made a great difference between them, in ascribing greater majesty and dignity to the Father, who commanded and issued out orders, than they did to the Son, who executed those commands in obedience to the Father. "Hence, says the Doctor, the Father is represented as primarily, eminently, and emphatically THE MAKER of heaven and earth, so as that the Son did not make the worlds by the Father, but the Father by him." See Serm. p. 111. Def. p. 183. 184.

the *original* source and fountain; the channel is well supply'd with *derived* streams. No more, in short, needs be essential to him, *by whom* God is pleased to form and *frame all*, than to that human Soul, *by which*, as the Doctor grants, he *governs all*. So that the superiority of the *Word*, to all created beings, hinders not its being the Soul of Christ; which for its immediate production, and the honour of being the first-born of the Creation, and for the dignity and authority conferred by God, has been styled *God*, and a *divine nature*, by them, who believe him not to be the self-existent independent God, as the Doctor professes his belief to be.

But the Doctor further argues, on the other hand, against the *Word's* being the Soul of Christ; from the miseries and temptations he felt, which he thinks, the *Word*, under such high characters, could not possibly be subject to. If the superior excellencies of the *Word* don't make it impossible to be Christ's Soul, he will have the imbecillities and troubles of that Soul render it inconsistent with being the *Word*; so that both shall not be one and the same mind. He says, *The maker and former of all things, who is essentially superior to all created beings, could not be tempted, &c.* But this being grounded on the same mistake of a necessary essential superiority supposed, has its answer in what I have already said, and may be further considered when I come to meet the same as urged again for an argument of his *quiescence* of the *Word*: for as he thinks the *Logos* cannot be Christ's rational Soul, he thinks also, that without its cessation, and quiescence during his ministry, its union to such an afflicted Soul, as Christ's oft was, is inconsistent. And therefore having laboured first to prove a self-existent divine

divine *Word* (distinct from the human Soul) united to our Lord Christ, he labours as much, in the next place, to prove, that there was no sign or token of his having any such thing, nor any use for it during his ministry; which I am next to consider.

That there was no appearance of any such self-existent supreme nature personally united to him, or such a *Word*, is readily granted without proving it; but that it was quiescent in him, will be deny'd by those, who hold there was no such thing, and that therefore there could be no just signs of it. And for the *Logos*, in the sense of Dr. *Clarke*, and others, (who, for ought I see, take it for the Soul of Christ) the Doctor will not pretend, nor need, that this should be quiescent: So that till he can, by good arguments, constrain them to yield that the *Word*, and rational Soul of Christ, are not the same, but *two* different minds; there is no occasion to dispute about this quiescence of nothing.

But because the granting the quiescence of the *Word*, while the rational Soul in Christ did not quiesce, would carry with it a concession, that it was not Christ's rational Soul, but a distinct mind; for this reason he endeavours to persuade us, that both Dr. *Clarke*, and also the *Arians*, must on their own principles grant, that the *Word*, in their sense of it, was, at least *some*-P. 128. times, *quiescent during his ministry, viz. when* under temptation by the Devil, and under his agonies: because, says he, no temptation could affect him; and no agony be upon him; if the *Word*, so powerful and excellent an agent, did exert and communicate its mighty influences.

To this it may be reply'd, that the Doctor has no right apprehension of the humiliation and incarnation of the *Logos*, according to his opposers' sentiments;

sentiments; for they think the Word *really embodied* itself, and became like the rational soul of another man, which is limited by the bodily organs, and is in a manner dormant in infancy; for by the settled laws of nature, it exerts not then its noblest powers: Man is at first but barely animal, and gradually those powers, and latent faculties, discover themselves according as the organs admit; and probably never display themselves in all their full strength, in this gross and seculent body; not till it be spiritualiz'd and refin'd at the resurrection. Now according to this opinion of the *Word* (which also makes our Saviour's humiliation very astonishing and endearing, and which is the true and *great mystery of godliness* that was *manifest * in the flesh*) 'twill be easy for them to admit the *Word* to be for a while deprived of its former extraordinary abilities, and in reality to become subject to sore temptations, and great afflictions: Also to *grow in wisdom* as others do; tho at the same time it did conduct his actions, and something very extraordinary too appear'd in him at twelve years of age, even before his great unction with the Holy Spirit, when he reasoned so wonderfully with the *Jewish Doctors*: so that it acted as the bodily organs admitted.

1 Tim. 3.
16.

But the Doctor's self-existent supreme God, (which is the *Word* in his sense) will not be supposed capable of such abasement. Can the Almighty *Jehovah* be brought low, or deny himself? Can his eternal perfections be confined? or his infinite mind lock'd up within narrow organs? or be tempted or afflicted? No: and therefore they who might admit some *quiescence* (in some kind and measure) upon the *Arian* principles,

* *Et lucet et latet*, seen darkly, or appear'd, tho in a mean dress, not in glory and splendour, 1 Cor. 13. 12. T. E.

ples, will still be as far as ever from *granting it upon his*. Nor is it harder to conceive the *Word* to be thus reduced, than the Doctor's allow'd pre-existent soul of Christ to be so.

He might as well argue from the quiescence of that noble pre-existent soul, which he allows had so often *personated the Almighty*, and had conducted his people *Israel*; and yet, after all that vast wisdom and experience which this supposes, he must grant, became as the souls of other infants; and increased in the common wisdom of men, and became subject to ordinary infirmities. Let him apply this to the *Word* in the sense of his opposers, and then see what advantage he can make of it, in favour of his *quiescence* of the supreme God (as he supposes) who is not subject to such passions, or restraint.

I grant this hinders not, but the Almighty may dwell in silence, and manifest himself more or less as he pleases, as he did in Prophets and Apostles at different seasons; but that in a *personal* union to the man Christ Jesus, he should, in so many years, give not one mark of it, is what the Doctor must prove for himself; for his opposers have no occasion for his kind help in this matter, and can do without it, if he cannot.

That the *Word*, in the *Arian* notion, should be sometimes quiescent in some degree for a while, and not exert its powers by external distinguishing tokens, is no wonder: for the human soul of Christ was so quiescent, whenever our Lord Jesus slept, till he awoke again; and so it is with other men. But what is this to a constant quiescence, which alone will do the Doctor any service? Nay, even the human soul of Jesus did acquiesce in his agonies, so far as not to exert all it could for preventing his death; since he says, he *could pray to Mat. 26. his Father, and have Angels enough sent in his 53. aid*; and shewed, when the officers came to him,

that he could have confounded and disarm'd Joh. 18. 6. them. He had then some *form of God*, a god-like majesty and authority, which yet he would not use, but laid by, and calmly suffer'd the death of a *slave*, and so took the *form of a servant*. But some quiescence, at particular times, is not like a perpetual cessation, which never affords one proof of the being of that thing which is supposed to be quiescent. And yet this is all the quiescence which *Irenæus* mentions in the Doctor's citation out of him, *viz.* That he submitted to be tempted, to die, and did not oppose his power to prevent the trial: but *he* was far from saying the *Word* was silent at other times, *viz.* in his miracles and discourses; nay, rather on the contrary, the cessation or quiescence on those particular occasions, implies, That the *Word* was not so usually, or at other times; much less at all times, in that Father's opinion.

I will not urge the Doctor with testimonies of primitive Christian writers, which method he chuses to decline; yet since he relies upon *Irenæus*, it will be but reasonable to let him and others know, that *he* was not of his opinion touching the *Word*: for he supposes the *Logos* to be *passible*, in opposition to the *Cerinthians*, in the chapter whence this citation is taken; and expressly says, L. 1. c. 4. ὁ Λόγος ἐπαθεν, *the Word of God was made flesh, and suffered*; and calls him, *patiens Verbum*, the suffering Word of God. So that he neither thought the *Word* to be the *impassible* self-existent God, as the Doctor does; nor that he was wholly *quiescent*, as to the bearing those afflictions, which yet he did so far acquiesce in, as not to prevent their coming on him, or to be a real temptation, and to afflict him sorely.

If the *Logos* (or divine Son) was not *passible*, why were the *Sabellians* call'd *Patripassians* for holding the *Father* and *Son* to be the same being under two names? If there were *no passion* either in the *Father*,

ther, or *Logos* (or Son) if it was no more, than a bare dwelling and operating in the flesh, which did suffer, how did the *Word* or *Son* endure more than the *Father*, since the *Father* did so dwell and operate, *John* 14. 10? Why was it not as scandalous, and as false to assert the passion of the *Son*, as of the *Father*, if they were both *equal*? Surely the truth was, that the *Word* or *Son* had a real sympathy and *painful feeling* with the flesh, which was not to be said of the *impassible Almighty Father*.

Having clear'd the way so far, I will next suggest some strong presumptions against his *hypothesis* of the *Word's quiescence*.

First, There is not the least hint of any such thing in the Gospel-history of Christ to found it upon. Tho the *Gospels* were written many years after Christ's ascension, and after the disciples are supposed to have been informed of this new and unsuspected mystery; yet they have not dropt one word of such a quiescence of the Divine Nature, nor made any apology for Christ's not appearing to be what they since found he was; nor made any reflexions upon their own ignorance or mistake, as in other cases they did. 'Tis strange that St. *John* (whose expression, *the Word was God*, is in a manner the whole foundation of the Doctor's opinion, as to Christ's supreme Deity) should not say something, why or how this had been purposely hid from men during Christ's abode in the flesh: nay, which is more, St. *John* takes notice of the quiescence, or undiscover'd secrecy of the *Word*, before his incarnation, even according to the Doctor's account, in those words, *And the Word was with God*: 'Tis strange, I say, he should not carry it farther, and say something to his lying hid too in his life! And, which yet presses harder, the Doctor tells us, those words, *The Word was with God*, are *opposed to his manifestation*, when the P. 189.

Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us; and that the Word was with God, till the time when God was manifest in the flesh. It seems then, he was not hid with God any longer; it was no longer a secret; but the *Word* was plainly discovered, when once he took flesh and conversed with men. And if so, then the disciples were not so ignorant of the Word's personal union to the flesh or body of Christ; for it was now *with them*, which formerly had been *with God* alone; the hidden secret condition of the Word was over: and therefore St. *John* might well say nothing of the Doctor's *quiescence* of the Word, when he had told us, he was manifested, and *they beheid his Glory*; which yet he could hardly but have spoken of, if otherwise.

Secondly, 'Tis strange, the Apostles, in their epistles, should not take some notice of this surprising discovery, newly made to them, that Jesus Christ was quite another person than they had ever thought him to be; and he, whom they always had taken for a mere man, aided by God, by later information since receiv'd, they understood was the self-existent God: They knew there was reason doubly to inculcate such an important point, and the more, because it was what had never been suspected by Christ's followers, who had never, from himself, had the least intimation of it, and would, as the Doctor says, have been much *shock'd* at it. But is there any notice of this great change in their opinion? They tell

Acts 3. 17, us, *The princes of this world knew him not*; but do they ever complain of their own great mistake? They tell us often how different and more

Phil. 2. 9, glorious an estate he was advanced to by his exaltation, in large expressions; but not one word what a much greater difference they had learned from his being in personal union with the Almighty God.

10.

The Doctor says, *He presumes our Lord did then* (i. e. at a meeting with the disciples after the resurrection) *reveal to them his divine nature.* So that he is not certain, this article of Christ's supreme Deity is any part of that Gospel, which *was first preached by our Lord, and afterwards confirmed by them who heard him*; but however he presumes it, and is confident it was *either by his own discourses after the resurrection, or else by the miraculous effusion of the Spirit at the day of Pentecost*, that this doctrine was imparted to them. P. 125.

But, since we have some account of both, let us see if there be any notice of such a new discovery in either; the Evangelist tells us what Christ discoursed of to his disciples after the resurrection, *Luke 24. 27.* But is there a word of this new and surprizing account of his divine person? In that *chapter*, excuse is made for them who knew not his bodily form, that their eyes were held; but is there any for the darkness of their minds, that they had not known him to be the self-existent God before? Is there any thing intimated of their changing their minds about his person, in this amazing point?

The same Evangelist tells us what was preached on the day of Pentecost, at the first effusion of the Spirit, by *St. Peter*; 'twas this, *Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God by signs and wonders which God did by him.* *Acts 2. 22.* Is this any higher account of Christ's person, than they had learned before? One would think, that having just now receiv'd that new and amazing discovery of Christ's being the self-existent God, the Apostle would have been full of it, at least not have left it out in his devout and just *encomium* of his sacred Lord and Master. *St. Peter* seems to have learn'd nothing new of Christ's person, or more than

Mat. 16. appear'd in his old confession, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.* Nor do any of the Apostles take any notice of this great alteration of the Christian faith in this point.

I know of no other writings that pretend to give any account of our Lord's discourses after his resurrection, unless it be the *Apostolical constitutions*; and these are so very contrary to the Doctor's notion of the self-existent *Word*, that I cannot suppose he will appeal to them.

Thirdly, How can this personal union consist with this pretended quiescence, which he supposes was total? What does the Doctor mean by union? What is the personal union, but a near relation and presence of the Divine nature to the human, in order to special operation upon, and by it? And where there is no such operation, what is the union? I think he will grant, as all men, I conceive, do grant, that the personal union is dissolved between man's soul and body, when the soul ceases, at death, to act in, and by the body; tho a sort of ineffectual relation may remain between the two natures still: and will not his quiescence of the *Word*, for so many years, equally imply such a dissolution of the personal union, if there had been such, between a divine and human nature, in Jesus Christ? Otherwise I want to know what he means by personal union. Hence,

Fourthly, 'Tis a great objection against his quiescent *Word*, that Jesus Christ himself gives us not any account of there being any such *person* in the divine self-existent nature, or any such *Word*, (name or thing) more than was manifest in himself. The *Father*, and the *Spirit* too, are oft mention'd by him; how is it then that he never mentions any *Word* or second person (which was not, as the Doctor grants, suspected to be

be himself) on any account? He might surely have spoken of the Almighty *Word*, and let his Disciples know there was such a person, and their duty to him, without saying any thing of the personal union to him; nay, since the operation and assistances of the Father and Spirit do not prove such an union of them to himself, why might not the *Word* sometimes have been particularly owned, and some things ascribed to him by Jesus Christ, which yet would have given no more suspicion of his being the *Word*, than of his being the *Holy Spirit*? But that it should always be declared, that he wrought by *the Spirit of God*; and that the *Father dwelt in him*, and *did his works*, and the like; and never once, that the *Word* (who was not thought, as he supposes, to be himself) assisted him, must seem very strange. Why his agency in common should be passed by, the Doctor gives no account, nor so much as *presumes* any; tho, he is not the backwardest, nor most barren in speculations, as his *New Theory* of the Trinity has convinced the world. So that it is plain, his quiescence of the *Word* was not at all needful for concealment of the personal union; but was altogether as great, as even the *Arians* or *Socinians* would need, on the supposition that there is no such person at all in the self-existent God; and who therefore say, it is no wonder there were no marks of it in the life or doctrine of the blessed *Jesus*.

Fifthly, I can't see, upon the Doctor's hypothesis, any ground left to assert any incarnation, or union of the *Word* to the *human Nature*, so early as *Christ's birth*: then indeed the pre-existent soul was embodied, as other mens, and soon manifested itself in the natural season. But what reason has he to say the divine *Word*, another intelligent infinite Being, was then united?

Acts 13.
33.

I remember not any countenance the Scripture is pretended to give in this case; it says, the *Word was made flesh*; but when? If it does not say, at his birth or conception, and if there appeared no good sign of it in all his life, then why might it not be afterwards, and not till his resurrection? when he was *begotten from the dead*, and it was said, *this day have I begotten thee*, by Almighty God. I can't but think this would mend the Doctor's scheme, and save him the labour of making out his *quiescence* of the *Word*; by saying, our Lord *Jesus* had been only a man in his lifetime on earth, but became the self-existent God afterwards; since it is not till then that he finds any proof of his personal union.

P. 149.

Mat. 10.
1.

Sixthly, I see not by any thing in his account but that the *Word* is quiescent still, if it was so during Christ's ministry. For what manifestation has there been of a divine *Word* or *Nature* in our Saviour, which may give us a clearer discovery of its personal union to his flesh, since the resurrection, than before? What new proofs (waving a while the sense of that expression, the *Word was God*) can the Doctor alledge in fact, to shew this hidden divine *Word* has since shone forth in fuller evidence? True indeed, Christ rose from the dead, and ascended on high, and sent forth the spirit in miraculous gifts; but what then? Did not the disciples hear him foretell these things, and yet not suspect his divine nature at all? And why shall the raising himself from the grave, be a proof (as he supposes) of his being the supreme God, to *Thomas*, who had, without suspicion of this, seen him raise *Lazarus*, who had been longer dead? and which the Doctor equals to his raising himself. As for his sending the Holy Ghost in miraculous gifts, he had formerly given his disciples a specimen of that,

that, and exercised it himself often : and the Doctor ascribes this effusion of the Spirit to the man Christ Jesus, telling us, That *the man Christ* P. 205. *Jesus disposes of these influences of the Spirit, as also the Apostles did.* And since he tells us, that *he* P. 155. *constantly declared to his disciples, that the man Christ Jesus should judge us at the great day, and yet they little thought of his having a divine nature ;* I cannot imagine what evidence, from any fact, there is to this day, of his having any divine nature in him, which was never discovered during his ministry on earth. And if it be still quiescent, for what end will the Doctor say the personal union serves ?

Seventhly and Lastly, I don't see, by the Doctor's way of arguing, that he can make it appear, that our Lord Jesus himself knew he had a divine nature united to him ; but that the man Christ was as ignorant of the *personal union*, as of the day of judgment, till his resurrection. For since nothing that he said or did, discovered that he had any knowledge of it, why should I believe he did know it ? And it would be a strange personal union, that himself neither was conscious, nor so much as inform'd of.

And now since the Doctor rely'd so much on this notion of the *Word's quiescence*, to furnish him with answers to many things objected against Christ's supreme self-existent Deity ; and particularly confesses, that without supposing it, no *tolerable* account can be given of our Saviour's not knowing the day of judgment : I hope, if P. 123. this fail him, he will rather yield, than betake himself to any *intolerable* accounts. If this great magazine of stores for defence be blown up, it will be expected, that he presently surrender with the poor remains into the hands of victorious truth.

C H A P. III.

An examination of the texts relied on by the Doctor, with an Appendix relating to the Deity of the Holy Ghost.

I Come now to examine the strength of those few remaining texts, to which he retreats in his twelfth chapter, as his only defence; to see if they prove our *Lord Jesus Christ to be the one self-existent God.*

Here I find but *two* texts, on which he grounds his proof, (indeed he had not many more left, and 'twas time to stop, else he had given up his cause) viz. *John* 1. 1. and *Heb.* 1. 10. For his other proof from *1 Tim.* 2. 5. relies wholly upon the interpretation of the *first* of those *two*, and needs no particular answer.

First, He produces St. *John's* testimony, viz. *The Word was with God, and the Word was God.* And indeed this alone must bear the weight of the whole cause, or he must give it up.

His argument lies thus: 'Since the holy Scriptures fully and expressly declare, both under the Law and the Gospel, that there is but one God, and but one being, who is God; and since 'tis acknowledg'd by all, that St. John intends the one self-existent Being, by the term God, with whom the Word was; therefore in saying the Word was God, he must mean that he was the same self-existent one God, or he must contradict the whole tenour of the Scriptures, by asserting a God besides the one God: whereas the Scriptures (says he) never distinguish upon the matter, nor once inform us, that tho there is but one supreme, yet there is another subordinate God.' Upon this

this he is so warm and positive, as to say, 'No possible exposition or sense of the word God, can reconcile the contradiction of this verse of St. John, to the other parts of the Bible, without admitting that the Word is the self-existent God: P. 189. so that we must either give up all the rest of the Scripture, or reject St. John's Gospel, as subverting the unity of God.' But since I am not so willing to give up either St. John's Gospel, or the rest of the Bible, I will still attempt to reconcile 'em, rather than hastily to declare, that if, on the other hand, St. John does not mean the Word to be God in an inferior sense, I will either reject him, or all the rest of my Bible: and I hope to shew, that the same sagacity and candour, with which the Doctor has been able to extricate himself so easily out of the pretended difficulties of other arguments and texts, will as easily help him thro this, and that in the very same way of reasoning. What I have to offer against his argument from this text, is,

1. That tho the holy Scriptures do declare there is but *one God*, yet they do at the same time call other beings by the *same name of God*. P. 61. The Doctor owns, that *Angels are often called אלהים, Elobim*. Now that is the very word which is translated *God*, in all those texts cited P. 177. by him, in which 'tis said, there is *no God*, or *Elobim, besides me*; and yet there are *Elobim* or Gods, besides him, by his own unavoidable confession. And the same self-existent Being, who says there is no *Elobim, or God, besides him*; does himself say, to mortal men in power, *I have* Psal. 82. *said ye are Elobim, or Gods, but shall die as men*. 8. So again, *Worship him all ye Elobim, or Gods*, Psal. 97. with many more the like. And what will the Doctor do in this case? Will he now give up the rest of his Bible, or all these texts? Is not the

the very foundation of his argument gone? If there be but one God, and yet other Gods also; is it not a very natural solution, to say there is emphatically but one God, in a peculiar super-eminent sense; and yet others, in a lower sense, by bearing some faint impressions of that supreme Majesty, and without comparison to him, are Gods also? And if in this sense St. *John* should say the *Word was God*, and *was with the God*, i. e. with the supreme *Παντοκράτωρ*; were this any more inconsistent with the scripture-account of but one God, than what I have already mention'd? So that he cannot say, the Scriptures do not distinguish, upon the matter, between *Elohim* supreme and subordinate, when expressly the

Deut. 10. Lord is said to be *a God of Gods*, or a great
17. God above all Gods.

2. If our Lord Jesus Christ might *justly* be call'd God, even tho he were not the one self-existent Being, or God; then St. *John* may very justly be interpreted, to mean the *Word was so God*, as not to be the self-existent God: because St. *John* in that sense would speak but *justly*; and therefore to make him speak *justly*, 'tis not necessary he should mean the *Word* to be the supreme God, when He says he *was God*. And that our Saviour might justly be call'd God, without being the supreme, the Doctor himself does grant, where he says, *Moses is styled a God to Aaron and Pharaoh, because he was inspired, and they learned the will of God from him; and* (N.B.) *consequently, our Saviour, who received the Spirit without measure, might more justly have been styled a God, on the account of his having been a great prophet.* Now since *Moses* was justly called God, (for it was by God himself) surely our Saviour, who might more justly be so call'd, without supposing a divine nature, might very well

P. 44.

well be so call'd by St. *John* in this text. So that the contradiction, fancy'd in this sense of the text, between St. *John* and the rest of the Bible, begins, I hope, to be less frightful. And I would not have him say *that was impossible* to be said by St. *John*, which himself grants *most justly* might have been said.

3. Besides what I have said, that St. *John* might justly call the Word *God*, and yet not the *supreme*; I add, that he has made a *distinction* between *God*, and *the God*. (1.) In the emphatical article prefix'd to the first, and not to the other. This article indeed is not always found before Θεός, when spoken of the supreme God, nor seems it needful: but if St. *John* intended to make a distinction, (when speaking of two under that character, it might be requisite to distinguish) he could not well omit giving the emphasis of *the God* to the supreme, whilst he withdrew it from the other. And therefore the Doctor had no good reason to make so light of this, which is counted of such moment, by *Philo* in *Lib. de Somniis*; by *Clemens Alexandrinus* in *lib. 3. Strom.* p. 460. *Ed. Paris.* and *Origen. Tom. 2. in Johan. &c.* telling us, that the true Almighty God is distinguish'd by this article, from *a God* without it. And *Origen* makes ὁ Θεός to distinguish the true God from Christ, who is Θεός; as ὁ Λόγος, the *Word*, said here of Christ, differences him from other Λόγοι, or *Words*: for any of the rational Spirits, Angels, or human Spirits, were oft so call'd, as may be seen in *Sandii dissert. ἐπὶ τῷ Λόγῳ*. But 'tis more considerable in *Philo Judæus*, who being a *Jew*, was very earnest and jealous for the *one God*; but yet thought it not inconsistent to admit a subordinate Λόγος, under the title of *a God*; and this in St. *John's* own time: which shews, how easily the Christian

Christian *Jewish* churches would understand St. *John's* Words in this sense; but could never have admitted the Doctor's sense of a *self-existent God*, being said to be with a *self-existent God*. (2.) In that the *Word*, call'd *God*, is said to have been *with God*. And this is inculcated twice; *The Word was with God, and the Word was God, and the same was with God*. Now if the meaning was, as the Doctor would have it, that the *Word* was that *same God*, that he was with, it is hard to see the occasion of guarding it before and after, with so much caution: as if any one could run into such an error, as to surmise he should not be with himself. Or if he had intended so much, it is very likely he would have said, he was with *himself*, rather than with *God*; which looks more like *another* than the *same*, in ordinary speech. What the Doctor says of *πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν* being opposed to his manifestation *πρὸς ἡμᾶς*, is true, but nothing of an answer: for his being in secret with God, no more shews him to be *that same God*, than his being with men afterward, proves him to be any of *those same men* he dwelt with. So that the difficulty and unnatural harshness of his interpretation, remains still as an objection against it: and is just such an objection, as lay against the different way of the *Photinians* reading this very text; when they read the last clause thus, *And God was*, and not *the Word was God*; leaving out the *Word*, or *Logos*. This is censur'd as most absurd, to make St. *John* say, *And God was*, when before-hand he had said the *Word was with God*; so that there could be no doubt but *he was*: *Quod nemo sanus scripserit, multo minus Evangelista Θεόπνευτος*, says the judicious Dr. *Mill*, *Proleg.* Surely it was no more reasonable to say, he was *with himself*.

4. 'Tis to be considered, that only St. *John* and he very late, uses the term *Word*, in which alone the Doctor finds the *very Deity* of the second person of the Trinity. And is it likely, that so many years after the Gospel of Christ had been preach'd, far and near, to Jews and Gentiles; and so many Churches formed upon his principles, (be it thirty, or forty, or more years) that St. *John* should then *first* reveal such an *article*? or should mean any thing considerably more, in calling our Saviour the *Word*, than the rest of the Apostles, (who were most, if not all of 'em dead) had meant by other characters, viz. the *Son of God*, the *Christ*, the *Lord Jesus*, &c. in which the Doctor pretends not to find this article? Why should the *Word* in St. *John* signify so much more than St. *Paul*'s calling him the *image of God*, or the *brightness of his Father's glory*? And yet the Doctor plainly suggests, that if these were interpreted of his divine nature, it would fairly prove that nature to be inferior to the very God. So that if it had been said, *And that image, &c. was God*, it had meant only an inferior God: and is it any harder to interpret the *Word was with God*, the same way? especially when he allows that the same St. *John* applies the character of the *Word* to the man *Christ Jesus* only, without any regard to the divine Nature, or *Word*; and which, if understood of the divine nature, or of the whole God-man, would really imply, that the *Word* is inferior to the very God; pag. 167. compar'd with pag. 170. Now if these words, *He was clothed with a vesture dipp'd in blood*, and his name is called the *Word of God*, must be spoken only of the man *Christ Jesus*; or at least of such a nature as is inferior to the very God; I think St. *John*'s other expression, *The Word was God*, may be allow'd the like interpretation: since there is no reason to imagine the same inspired

Col. i. 15.
Heb. i. 2.

P. 170.

Rev. 19.
13.

spired writer should not in both places (and perhaps all in which it is used) use that remarkable title, of the same person, in the same sense.

P. 216.

But I must not press this too hard, because, tho the Doctor hath said all that I have mention'd; yet, to do him justice, he says quite the contrary afterwards: for he makes that name, *the Word of God*, to be a proof of his being a *distinct person* in the self-existent God, whose *Word* he is; and this after he had numbred it among those texts, which are spoken of the man Jesus Christ, *without any regard to the Word, or divine nature*; as indeed the whole context speaks of a *man* with his *name on his thigh*. So that until I know which half of the contradiction he is willing to part with, I let it pass.

5. There is no more difficulty in the seeming contradiction between those texts, which declare there is but one God; and St. *John's* styling the *Word* a God, in another and inferior sense, than there is in many other instances: which yet the Doctor, and all other *Trinitarians*, (if I may account him such) can easily reconcile; and therefore he ought not to make it so insuperable a difficulty in this single case, as he pretends it is.

Isa. 43.
11.

Hosea 13.
4.

P. 161.

For instance, 'tis as positively and expressly said by God himself, *There is no Saviour besides me*, as that *there is no God besides me*, in the following chapter. And both are put on the same foot together, *Thou shalt know no God but me, for there is no Saviour besides me*. And yet the man Christ Jesus is certainly styled our Saviour, or *Jesus*, all along in the New Testament; which the Doctor confesses, *betokens that man whom the blessed Virgin brought forth, and implies nothing of an incarnate God in the notion of it*. Nay, it is a character into which he is exalted by

by God, and therefore can't belong to the infinite supreme God: *Him hath God exalted, to be a Prince and Saviour.* And he is call'd Saviour at the same time, where the great God is called so, tho in an inferior sense, and as subordinate to God: *The love of God our Saviour appeared* Tit. 3. 4. 6. *—who saved us by the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us, thro' Jesus Christ our Saviour.* So that here is God our Saviour, and yet another instrumental Saviour; tho the Scriptures say there is but one (in the most emphatical sense) who is Saviour. Just as in St. John, there is *the God* (in the most eminent sense) and *a God with him*; tho still there is but *one God* in the highest sense of that character, according to the Scriptures.

So again, we read there is but one Lord: *Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord*; Mark 12. which is the same as to say, there was but one Lord, as well as but one God, as the Scribe's answer shews. And yet we find another Lord, *The Lord said to my Lord, ὁ Κύριος τῷ Κυρίῳ.* So again, if it be said, there is but one only who knows the hearts of men, the Doctor can easily reconcile this with the man Christ Jesus's, nay, with the Apostles knowing the hearts of others; tho not as God knows them, of himself, but as knowing them by the Spirit's assistance. Again, *God alone doth wonders*; and yet the Apostles did great wonders also, but by God's power. Twenty instances, I suppose, might be produced, of characters appropriate, in some sense, to the supreme God, which yet are (without any express marks of distinction, but what the nature of the subjects plainly suggest to us) attributed to inferior beings. *God only is holy*; he *only is wise*, &c. But these give no difficulty to a candid mind, tho others be said to be holy and wise.

too, in an inferior sense. And therefore if St. John should have styled the *Word* a God, in a subordinate notion; and did think, by saying he was with *the God*, he had sufficiently distinguished him from the one supreme God; especially telling us at the same time, *that the Word was flesh*, &c. I see not how the Doctor, with his usual candour about him, can be offended, or any way perplexed, to reconcile this with the Scripture-testimonies of one God only. He need not give up *the rest of the Scriptures*, nor yet reject St. John's Gospel. He needs only part with his own harsh, unnatural interpretation of the first verse of it, and then all will be easy: for I don't find any other text would give him much trouble. And this method is no more than, in other cases, he would and does frankly use: so that I can't but think he might have given up this text, as well as others, if he had any other in reserve, by which to support his hypothesis, or to give any graceful appearance of having maintain'd the current orthodox doctrine.

P. 265.

To conclude this argument, I would only know of the Doctor, who counts it impossible to reconcile the one self-existent God, with giving the character of *God* to any who is not that same self-existent God, what he thinks of his so oft-approv'd *Nicene Creed*, which he imagines may be proved by Scripture; when having first styled the Father, *the One God*, it calls the Son, *God of God*? Does he really think, (*he who justly trembles at the guilt of collusion, in subscribing or using such forms, as thwart the sense of a man's own mind*) that it means the self-existent God, of the self-existent God, begotten before all worlds, of the Father? Does he thorowly receive and believe this? Or does it not mean a derivative, subordinate God, of a *self-existent* God?

Secondly,

Secondly, His other text, now to be consider'd, is Heb. 1. 10. *And thou Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands: They shall perish, but thou shalt endure. They shall be changed, but thou art the same, and thy years fail not.*

The Doctor tells us, the author of this Epistle assures us, that this passage is meant of the Son, P. 192.
viz. our Lord Jesus Christ, and that the 102d Psalm, whence it is cited, is address'd to *Jehovah*, or the self-existent God: and thence it follows, that the Son is that *Jehovah*, the self-existent God. I shall wave what he says of *Jehovah's* being the incommunicable name of God, (which I think he has not proved, but rather the contrary) because I rely not on that answer. Only I cannot but observe, that having, as he thought, got another and surer argument, by proving Jesus Christ to be *Jehovah*, he now begins to give up what he had argued from St. *John*, by saying, *Whatever latitude may be allow'd to Gods*, P. 193.
God, in St. *John*; yet *Jehovah* is appropriate to the one God, in contradistinction to all other Gods. So that it seems the word God, in St. *John*, may, after all, be allow'd a latitude; and others may have that character, besides the one self-existent God; and consequently the *Word* being styled God, might yet not be the self-existent God. And why then did he stand so stiffly to it before? But perhaps he did not then see, he had this other argument for a reserve. But to his present argument, I reply:

1. That every accommodation of a text to any person is no sufficient evidence that 'tis the same person, of whom it was originally spoken. For instance, St. *Matthew*, chap. 2. 15. says it was fulfill'd, in Jesus Christ, *what the Lord had spoken*

by the Prophet, saying, *Out of Egypt have I called my Son.* Now where will the Doctor find these words, but in *Hos. 11. 1?* where, 'tis plain, they were spoken of the people of *Israel*: *When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt.* Were the people of *Israel* and *Jesus Christ* therefore one and the same, because, for the likeness of the case, what was said of one is apply'd to the other? No, surely! And therefore, if the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, who had said, *ver. 2.* that *God made the worlds by, or thro', his Son,* did, from this, think he might accommodate to the instrument, what had been said of the principal working by him; is this more strange or untuitable, than the foregoing application was?

2. It doth not appear to me, that the Author of the Epistle assures us, these words are spoken of the *Son*: For observe how he brings them in, *ver. 8, 9, 10.* *Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever——Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. And thou, Lord, hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands: they shall perish, but thou remainest; they shall be changed, but thou art the same, thy years shall not fail.*

Here we may observe, that the *tenth* verse, *And thou Lord, &c.* (tho it is a new citation) is not prefaced with, *And, to the Son he saith,* as *ver. 8.* or with an *Again,* as *ver. 5, 6.* and so *chap. 2. 13.* but barely, *And thou Lord.* Now the *God* last mention'd was *Christ's God*, who had anointed him; and the *Author* thereupon addressing himself to this *God*, breaks out into the celebration of his *power*, and especially his *unchangeable duration*; which he dwells upon, as

what he principally cites the text for; in order, I conceive, to prove the stability of the Son's kingdom, before spoken of: *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; God thy God has anointed thee; and thou Lord, i. e. thou who hast promised him such a throne, art he, who laid the foundation of the earth, and by thy hands made the heavens, which tho of long and permanent duration, yet will at length perish; but thou remainest, thou art the same, thy years shall not fail.* So that it seems to be a declaration of God's immutability made here, to ascertain the durableness of Christ's kingdom before mention'd: and the rather so, because this passage had been used originally for the same purpose in the 102d Psal. viz. to infer thence this conclusion, ver. ult. *The children of thy servants shall continue, and their seed be established before thee.* In like manner it here proves the Son's throne should be established for ever and ever, by the same argument, viz. by God's immutability; and so was very pertinently alledg'd of God, without being apply'd to the Son; to shew how able *his God*, who had anointed him, was to make good and maintain what he had granted him, viz. a durable kingdom for ever*.

And it gives some farther strength to this interpretation, that the creation of the world is never once, that I remember, ascribed immediately to the Son in such terms; but 'tis constantly said, John 1. 3. 1 Cor. 9. 6. Eph. 3. 9. that all things were made *thro' him*, δι' αὐτοῦ, and δι' αὐτῶν.

Y 3

And

* That these words were thus understood by the antients appears hence, that they interpret *thy hands* to be the Son and Spirit, which they could not do, if they understood the sentence to be spoke of Christ. See *Irenæus*, lib 4. c. 6. lib. 5. c. 3. *Tertul. advers. Hermog.* c. 45. No one antient writer ever applied these words to Christ during the three first centuries; nor does Dr. *Waterland* pretend it was ever so applied, till the fourth or fifth. See his *Sermons*, p. 65.

Col. 1. 16. And if it is never said *elsewhere* in Scripture,
 Heb. 1. 1. that he created all things, it is not very likely it
 should be *here* said of *him* by the *Psalmist*, or by
 the author of this epistle, since the words are ap-
 plicable to another, even God the *Father*, whom
 this very author had said, but a few verses before,
 to have *made the worlds by his Son*.



*An APPENDIX, containing some
 Considerations on what the Doctor
 says concerning the Holy Ghost.*

WHAT relates to the *Holy Ghost*, the
 Doctor says, *he hopes to bring to a more
 speedy issue*. And I think he has done
 so indeed: for he has roundly given up *his per-
 sonality*, and consequently ended the dispute with
 those *Socinians*, who account the Holy Spirit to
 be only the *divine virtue and energy*; and who
 will never deny the divinity of the power or at-
 tributes of the Almighty Father: and so he has
 done the work with great expedition. Indeed
 having formerly confuted the *eternal procession*,
which, says he, *some of the antients in the fourth*
century, hurried on by zeal for a fundamental, so
as not duly to weigh their arguments, thought to
be a demonstration of the divinity of the Holy Ghost;
but they took a wrong (tho I think the only one
 pretended) *text to make it out by*; he had so much
 the less to do.

Annot. on
 Common
 Prayer,
 p. 290.

The reason why I say he has given up the per-
 sonality of the Holy Spirit, (tho he still sometimes
 calls

calls him a *person*) is, that he has yielded up either the only argument for it, or at least that grand argument, in the overthrow of which all the rest must sink: and that is, from Christ's promise of the comforter, viz. the *Holy Ghost*, John 16. where the Spirit is set forth under so many personal notes and characters; *He shall come, He shall guide, &c.* especially ver. 13. ἐκεῖνος πνεῦμα, *He, the Spirit, &c.* that it has been, I think, the only difficulty that has given the *Socinians* any great trouble smoothly to remove. They have pleaded it was a *strong figure*, and the Doctor says it is so; and represents it as an *allegory* and *metaphor*, and a *chain of metaphors*; by P. 294. which we are to understand no more, than that God or Christ bestows the gifts of the Spirit; and likens it to that admirable *prosopopœia*, Prov. 8. 22—31. So that a power, or operation, is set out under the elegant fiction of a person; tho it be none in reality.

I do not say but the Doctor and the *Socinians* have very much to alledge in the case; nor do I blame him for complying with just evidence, wherever he thinks he sees it: but then, I think, he can never retrieve the *personality* of the Spirit, by any stronger argument from the holy Scriptures. He may, indeed, offer something for the *Deity* of the *Holy Spirit*, if no *distinct person* from the *Father*; yea, he may do it with consent of all sides. And all his arguments to prove the *Holy Ghost very God*, shall be granted him by the *Unitarians* of all sorts, while he grants the *Socinians* their arguments, to prove the *Holy Spirit* is no more than a *metaphorical person*.

Not that I think the Doctor was overseen, or unawares was too easy in this matter; no, all things consider'd, he has been wary and subtle enough. He had one to oppose, who is generally

P. 205.

look'd on as *Arianizing* in this point, pleading for the *real personality of the Spirit*, from our Lord's description of him, as a subordinate messenger and minister; and I judge, he saw well enough, that if that description was to be literally taken, as of a real person, it would prove him one inferior to God and Christ; and there would be no defending his supreme Deity: and therefore he calls it a *very difficult passage*. Hereupon he takes shelter under the *Socinians* against the *Arians*, and hopes he may defend the Deity of the Holy Spirit, whatever becomes of his true distinct personality. For granting the Spirit to be a person, there was no pretence for an allegory.

Nor do I find any argument to prove it such, or that the Spirit was not literally sent as a messenger: however it be, I can't but observe how gracefully the Doctor sets the matter off. Lest any should think it a disappointment to find the promise of the comforter so interpreted, he spares no *encomium* upon it; he tells us of figures, allegory, metaphors, *prosopopæia*; but then they are not ordinary ones; they are figures, but they are *strong figures*; it is an allegory, but it is a *noble allegory*; it is a *prosopopæia*, but it is an *admirable one*.

And thus indeed he may very well prove the Deity of the Spirit; for take away his proper distinct personality, and who will deny the divinity of God's power, or operations, as connoting in them their agent? But this is so far from being a peculiar *Christian* doctrine, that I suppose no *Turk*, *Jew*, nor *Pagan*, doubts such *figurative*, *metaphorical*, *prosopopæia*-persons, (in the Deity) of attributes, operations, modes, properties, or any such *Sabellian* disguises. And indeed when the Doctor is got out of his metaphors, and speaks directly of the *Spirit's* personality; I think
it

it amounts to no more : of which hereafter. And this will answer all his arguments for the *Holy Spirit's* being the *very God*.

The question in dispute is not, Whether there be not, in God, something that is call'd *Spirit*; or whether the Spirit, in Scripture, does not sometimes imply what is God : for if *God be essentially a Spirit*, then, no doubt, this Spirit is God. And this is said of the Father, and so carries no personal distinction in it : *John 4. 24. God is a Spirit*. So *Psal. 139. 7. Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?* Nay since (what none can deny) the Doctor owns, in agreement with Dr. P. 245. *Clarke*, that the Holy Spirit in Scripture, sometimes signifies the *mere power of God*; there needs be no dispute neither, whether this be not God, and have not all the incommunicable characters of the Almighty. But the question is, whether, besides this allow'd notion of the Holy Spirit, there be not, by our Saviour, mention made of *John 16.* an Holy Spirit, who is a distinct person from the Father (who also is a Spirit) in a proper sense; or at least who is more properly a person, than the mere power and energy of the Almighty is? The Doctor has not shown there is any such Holy Spirit at all, and the *Arians* say there is, and that he is inferior to God; and may well complain that their opposers, when they would prove the Holy Spirit to be the one God, only bring their proofs in relation to the former notion of the Spirit, or the divine power and energy, (which is not denied) but none that proves the Deity of any other Holy Spirit, viz. *a person*. And this is manifest in the Doctor's *two* texts, on which he relies, for evidence of the Holy Spirit's Deity.

His argument, from *Luke 1. 32, 35.* is, viz. *That since Jesus Christ is therefore the Son of the most High God, because the Holy Ghost begat him,* P. 200.
it

P. 209.

it follows, the Holy Ghost must be *that very God*, else the most High God was not his *immediate Father*. But it is plain, by the *Holy Ghost* there, is meant the power of God, and it is so explain'd; *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and (or even) the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee*. Strange! that one, who says the Holy Spirit, in Scripture, sometimes signifies the *mere power of God*, should pretend any other sense here, where it is so express'd; and then sure enough the power of God will not be *another being from him*. But what is this to the Holy Spirit, about whom the controversy lies; and who is a distinct person? This is the unjust way of, almost all, the writers for the Deity of the Holy Ghost; tho they grant it has different acceptations, both for the *power of God*, and also for a *person*, yet they never distinguish in their arguments, but confound both together; and because the divine power, or Holy Spirit, has *supreme* characters, therefore the *Holy Spirit, Christ; prime minister*, (as the Doctor calls him) must have them also: as if both were one and the same. But by distinguishing them, *their* arguments are easily answer'd, who, of *one* Holy Spirit, prove the personality, viz. that in *John 16.* and of the Spirit in the *other* sense, viz. the divine active *virtue*, prove the Deity, and then put both together into one: whereas they should prove the *personal* Holy Spirit to be *God*, or that the same Spirit which is proved to be a distinct person is so; else they argue not *ad idem*, in the Deity, and in the personality; nor at all against the Unitarians.

His other and main argument is from *1 Cor. 2. 10, 11.* *The Spirit searcheth the deep things of God: for what man knoweth the things of man, save the Spirit of man, which is in him? Even so*
the

the things of God, knoweth none but the Spirit of God. Hence the Doctor infers, that the Spirit of P. 199. God is as much that God, whose Spirit he is, as the Spirit of a man is that man in whom it is; and that the Spirit of God is as much God himself, as the Spirit of a man is the man himself, and not a distinct being.

But, whatever be the meaning of these expressions, what does this avail towards proving the Deity of that Spirit, who is a distinct *person*, in God? For it may as well be argu'd hence, that as the Spirit of a man is the same person, and not distinct from the man, so the Spirit of God is the same person with God, and not a distinct person from that God whose he is: for the Spirit of a man (to which the Spirit of God is liken'd) is as *much* the same person with the man, as it is the same being; and perhaps something *more* so: because, in the man, there is another different being besides his Spirit, but not another person. So that it may be as well pretended that the Spirit of man is a different person from the man himself, as (and in the same sense too) that the Spirit of God is a different person from God. And yet this, I think, is all he pretends to prove the personal distinction from, *viz.* because it is call'd the P. 216. *Spirit of God*; and this, it seems, as the soul is the *Spirit of man*, which yet is without being a distinct person. So that whether by the Spirit of God, in this text, St. Paul meant only God, who is essentially a Spirit, as the rational soul is a Spirit; or the divine virtue, and inspiration of God; neither of these is the person of the Holy Ghost, which the inquiry is of, or whose Deity is deny'd.

And this is evident, according to the Doctor's (at least the common) principles, that it is not the one distinct and third person in the God-head,

head, that is intended by the Holy Spirit in this text; because it is said, *None (ὅδεῖς) knows the things of God, save the Spirit of God*: which, if appropriated to the third person, would exclude the *Word*, nay, and the first person too, from this knowledge; and so in proving the Deity of the Holy Ghost, would destroy that of the *Word*.

Indeed I think it most likely, that the Apostle, by the *Spirit*, here, intends the divine *Afflatus*, or inspiration; because, *ver. 12.* he calls it τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, the Spirit which comes forth, or out from God; and is opposed to the Spirit of the world, *i. e.* the *genius*, the *disposition*, or dictates and wisdom of the world. So the Doctor expressly tells us, *This expression τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, relates to the allegory of his mission, signifying the gift of the Spirit, and not the being from whom they flow*; as he says a little after of the Holy Ghost. So that there is no reason to stretch a similitude, for illustration, to its utmost length, when it no way appears that the Apostle intended to shew more than this, *viz.* how the immediate inspiration of God was the only effectual way of coming to the right knowledge of divine mysteries. For he does not say that *because* the Spirit of God is one with God, in the same manner as the Spirit of a man is one with the man himself, therefore it knows the things of God; but only, *as* the Spirit of a man knows the things of a man, so the Spirit of God knows the things of God; *i. e.* as certainly and perfectly knows them, or rather makes them known: because the Apostle *Ver. 1, 2.* uses the word so, *I desire to know, i. e.* (by an usual Hebraism) to make known, *nothing among you, save Christ, and him crucify'd*; and the context requires, or well fits it. And then, if the Doctor can spare us his *noble allegory*, or one link only

only of his long *chain of metaphors*, by a very easy and usual *prosopopœia*, to speak of the divine inspiration, after the manner of a person, the Apostle's words (which are to prove, that God had revealed mysteries to them) are thus: *For the divine inspiration discovers the secret things of God; for as no man can make known the things of a man, i. e. what his own thoughts and purposes, and inclinations are — except the man himself discovers them; so none but the inspiration of God hath made known the purposes and mind of God. Now we have received, not the subtle learning and wisdom of this world, but the inspiration of God, that we may make known to men what we have freely received of God; which things accordingly we speak, &c.* So that here is nothing of difficulty, nor of the controversy in hand, unless it be to shew, against Dr. Clarke, and others, that there is no real person meant by the Holy Spirit in Scripture, only the divine power and inspiration, which is what most *Socinians* agree to.

C H A P. IV.

General Observations on the Doctor's New Scheme.

I Come in the last place to make some general *Observations* on the Doctor's *New Theory of the Trinity in Unity*; and to shew some of the great absurdities and inconsistencies therein, as they appear to me.

But I would first take notice that he agrees intirely with Dr. Clarke, with *Arians* and *Socinians*, against the *Atbanasians* and *Trinitarians*, in the Scripture-notion of the divine *Father*, viz. that P. 231. he is but *one person in the common sense*; and that there is no Almighty God, or Person, but *He*; and

P. 245. and *that* there is no Almighty Eternal Person intended by the character of Son of God *there*; but that the Son is a pre-existent, *inferior mind*, united to a body by the Holy Ghost; and that the Holy Spirit sometimes signifies the power and operation of God the Father. And it happens
P. 211. that the Doctor has given the same interpretation of the baptismal form, *Mat. 28. 19.* as Dr. Clarke had in his *Paraphrase*.

Indeed he makes the *Son* and *Spirit* of lower consideration, than Dr. Clarke does; not thinking altogether so highly of the inferior pre-existent rational nature of Christ, nor so much maintaining the proper *personality* of the Holy Spirit, as he.

To make amends for these, he has started another Trinity in the *Scripture-Father* (the first person in the *baptismal form* and *creed*.) The first, he says, is nameless, the others are the *Word* and *Spirit*; all three in the *Father of the man Christ Jesus*, his only-begotten Son. So that here is a Trinity of *Fathers*, who all have that common name, and who all begat the Son of God, which he expressly says of the *Spirit*, and does not say the *Word* was *quiescent* in this matter. Now as
P. 237. Dr. Clarke has not affirm'd or deny'd any thing, about such a Trinity in the *Scripture-Father*, as not to the purpose of religion, and which in some sense may be in every intelligent mind; and for which there is no just pretence from Scripture, unless it be taken from the attributes and operations of God the Father; so I can't but judge the Doctor's new scheme as very absurd, for these Reasons:

1. *First*, His notion of *Persons* in the God-head amounts to no more than attributes or operations, allow'd by all sorts of *Unitarians*. His notion is laid down, *pag. 218.* where he says

(of the three persons) *What is meant is pretty generally agreed, viz. that the Father, Word, and Spirit, tho they are really distinct, so that one is not the other, yet are not separate beings, but one and the same being, which is the self-existent God.*

This is what he oft refers us to, as his sense of P. 245.

the term *persons*. Some things truly distinguish'd, in the same being, is his notion of persons. Now

cannot any one say as much as this, of the divine attributes, of wisdom, power, goodness, truth, holiness? Are not these truly distinguish'd, and yet not separate beings? And indeed he

seems not to pretend to any higher distinction than that of the faculties or operations of every

mind, by what he says, *I do not affirm, that* P. 241.

the Word is the internal reason or wisdom of God, an attribute or power of him; because the Scriptures have not declared any such thing: as if this

should not also have kept him from calling *this Word a person*. So that he pretends not to have

any thing from Scripture or reason, against the *Word's* being an attribute of God; only he had

not enough to warrant his asserting it. But yet

it may be so, for any thing he intends to say to the contrary. And for what does he then pre-

tend to write for the *holy Trinity*, or against Dr. Clarke? Who is his adversary? Who denies

such a Trinity in the Almighty God, as he finds in himself? *viz.* of operations, powers, &c.

tho all may not agree what names to give them.

But then he can't tell how to make this consistent with the *incarnation of the Word only*.

'Tis hard to pretend an operation or faculty of the soul should be *made flesh*, and not the soul

itself; and if so, then all the powers of it are incarnate together. And if the *divine nature* was

incarnate, then all the attributes are included in it, and so all three persons become incarnate;

which

which confounds the whole scheme ; and for this reason, a scholastic Trinity, of modes and attributes, has justly been rejected with great contempt, as trifling with sacred matters, and arguing indeed against no body.

P. 220. The Doctor's explication of this matter by a *triangle, touching a point at one angle only*, shews how necessary a *real distinction* of beings is to make out the incarnation of one of the persons only: for unless he supposes the three persons are as much three as the three angles of the triangle, which are distinct parts, and make up one compound, it is not to his purpose. And truly he seems to me, at other times, to suppose that the three persons are three *distinct beings*; and that by one self-existent God he means one consisting of the three beings. I know very well, P. 218, he speaks of *God's simple uncompounded being*; 219, 220. but then it is only by way of supposition, as what *may be*. And what he means by God's simplicity, he lets us know by saying, *It only excludes a composition of separable parts*. So that distinct beings, or three infinite minds *inseparably* united, may consist with his notion of the divine simplicity and unity; which he farther shews, by resembling the union of the three persons into one God to the union of the *two beings*, soul and body, into one man, whom he calls *one and the same being, which they are necessarily constitutive of*; and therefore are inseparable parts, (I think) of a man, in his sense.

Now if soul and body, two most distinct beings, and of different kinds, may be one and the same *being*, in the Doctor's account; I see not but the *Father, Word, and Spirit* may be three distinct beings, or minds, and yet make still but P. 218, 19. *one being*, in his sense. *I do by no means*, says he, *say the Father, Word, and Spirit are different* Sub-

substances, as the soul and body in man are, the one material, and the other immaterial: i. e. he is only against the three divine persons being of divers kinds, but says nothing against their being distinct individual beings, of the same kind; but concludes, If the union of distinct substances, may constitute one and the same being, man; then the Father, Word, and Spirit may constitute one and the same uncompounded being, God. He cannot well mean, by uncompounded, any thing, but not consisting of different sorts of beings, as soul and body are; because if he intends by uncompounded, not constituted of three distinct beings at all, his inference would be ridiculous, viz. if the union of soul and body, which are two substances, can yet constitute one compounded being, then surely these three, Father, Word, and Spirit (who are not two substances) may constitute one uncompounded being; since they then not only may, but must necessarily be one being; and there could be no need to prove that what is not two, may be but one. Indeed he says he will affirm nothing of their joint substance, i. e. I suppose, whether it be constituted of distinct substances joined together, or not; but then he cannot affirm they constitute one uncompounded being, if it may be constituted of three united beings; unless by uncompounded beings, he means one uncompounded of several sorts of beings, in which sense only he allows the great God to be a simple being and uncompounded. Nor would it at all follow, that because two different substances may be one compounded being, therefore three distinct substances, not different in kind, may be one uncompounded being; unless it means uncompounded of different sorts.

I am sensible it is folly and rashness to talk so freely of the *substance* of the great God, and the

constitution of his being; for we know not what
 Job 38. 2. we talk about, and do but *darken counsel by words
 without knowledge*; but the Doctor's reasonings
 upon it have led me to take some notice thereof:
 and indeed they, who are so positive as to declare
 it for an article of faith, That the one God and
 his Son are *consubstantial*, (as the Doctor in his
Preface does, calling it that *great truth*). should,
 I think, know well what it means, when they are
 so very sure of it. The like I may say, as to the
 meaning of the word *persons* in the Godhead;
 which being not the Scripture-language, but of
 mens own introducing and devising, I may justly
 demand what their meaning by it is. And they
 are justly to be censured, when they voluntarily
 introduce, or chuse and justify terms of art in
 great articles, and then cannot tell what they
 mean by their own inventions, but sometimes one
 thing, and sometimes another; thinking to get
 off by saying, *Let these terms be used, till better
 be substituted in their room*; as if it were better to
 talk at random, and so perhaps foolishly and
 inconsistently of the Almighty, than to hold our
 peace in humble and reverent silence. And
 therefore the Doctor's defective, insignificant,
 and uncertain account of his meaning by the
 term *persons*, is one just objection against his
 book; as leaving the main point in utmost con-
 fusion and obscurity, which it pretends to explain
 and prove.

P. 218.

2. *Secondly*, I find that instead of a *Trinity*,
 which he pretends to prove in his way, he has
 found out but *two* persons in the very God; and
 having lost the *first person*, his Trinity is lost too.
 He all along supposes the term *Father* to be no
particular name of *one* of the persons in the sacred
 Scriptures, but that it denotes the self-existent
 one God, in *which* his three persons are to be
 found;

found; because he is sensible there is no supreme self-existent God, but he whom the Scriptures style the *Father*, and the *God and Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ; and tells us off, that he is never called the *Father of the Word*. Hereupon P. 237. he racks his thoughts to find out a Trinity here; but tho he finds a *Word* and a *Spirit* to say something of, he cannot find a *first* person mention'd; for he says, *That he is never by any particular name distinguished in Scripture from the Word and Spirit*. Where then must he find this other distinct person, whom the Scriptures have not once vouchsafed to name; as if only the *first* person was of no concern to men? Why truly he will gather it by implication; and how does he make it out?

All his evidence is, that in Scripture the *self-existent God is plainly distinguish'd from the Word and Spirit*, in that the *Word is called the Word of God*, and the *Spirit the Spirit of God*; and consequently they are distinguish'd from God, whose they are. P. 216.

Now one would be apt to think by this, that the *Word* and *Spirit* should not be that self-existent God, from whom they are so plainly distinguished, as he very truly affirms: and indeed at another time the Doctor thinks the substance of the self-existent Being will admit only of some distinction *in itself, but not from itself*, which is P. 221. more cautious than the other. But then to make out three persons distinct from each other, it was necessary to say the *Word* and *Spirit* are distinguished from God, because the Doctor could find nothing to distinguish them from, but the self-existent God; and yet they must be the same with what they are plainly distinguish'd from. So that now the *Word* and *Spirit* are to be distinguished

P. 235. from what Dr. *Clarke* accounts the *First* person, or intelligent being, the very God; which yet Dr. *Bennet* denies elsewhere.

But it is a most weak pretence the Doctor offers for proof of some other third *person's* being imply'd in the word *God*, (supposing the *Word* and *Spirit* to be not distinct beings, but *this God*, as he does suppose) for there is then no need at all of a third person, to justify the expressions, the *Word* and *Spirit of God*, by his own principles, (except that he needs to find out a third somewhere, to make out his *Trinity*) because these two alone, *viz. Word* and *Spirit*, will suffice to solve all: for if the *Word* be God, and the *Spirit* be God, the *very God*; then the expression *the Word of God*, may mean the *Word of God the Spirit*; and the *Spirit of God*, may mean the *Spirit of God the Word*; and *the Word with God*, may be *with God the Spirit*. What needs he then invent a third? Let two suffice, since he owns he cannot find any more mention'd in Scripture; only let him not call them a *Trinity of two*; for that is all he can pretend to, in this way of proving it.

And yet it is on this mighty pillar alone that the Doctor builds his proof of the *Trinity*; and of all he says in justification of the *eternal generation*, and his calling the *Word* the *eternal Son of God*, without any precedent in Scripture for such an attempt. In a word, all he can say, in justification of the church's *Litany*, *Creeds* and *Offices*, in the use of these unscriptural terms, according to his principles, relies upon this poor quibble, which I am astonished should see the light from any man of his thought and learning.

For to argue from the expressions, the *Word of God*, and *Spirit of God*, (whom he takes to be the

the same God) that there must be a third person meant by *God*, whose they are; is just as if he had argued, that because we read of the soul of a *man*, and the body of a *man*, therefore there must be a third thing in *man* distinct from both, whose they are, tho it have only the common name of *man*; when indeed there is no more in man but those two: even so, tho there were no more in God than the *Word* and *Spirit*, (and he says no more is named in Scripture) it might be truly said, the *Word of God*, and *Spirit of God*: so that this does not prove another, or third person, which the Doctor still wants.

3. *Thirdly*, I observe, that as he has lost the *first* person, so even of these his remaining *two* persons, he has confounded the characters, and has left no *distinction* between them: For in straining to make the *Word* in the divine nature, a Son, (I suppose, to accommodate it to the offices of the church, tho' he grants 'tis not according to the sacred text) he has overdone it, and made them both *Sons*. Since the patrons of the common opinions run wholly upon the characters of *Father* and *Son* in the Trinity which they worship as the supreme God, it was needful for him to make some pretence for applying these characters, which belong to Christ's human, to the divine nature; and for that end to make out the relations of *Father* and *Son* within the one self-existent God, that as *Son* he may be esteem'd one of the divine Persons, and worthy of the supreme adoration given him under that character, and not under that of *the Word*. P. 162.

This was indeed a hard task! since he grants, the Scriptures know no *Father* but the *one God*; nor *Son of God*, but the *man Christ*, begotten by God by a temporal generation. How then shall

P. 217. he make out a *Father* and *Son* in the *Deity*? Yet, says he, *because the Word subsists eternally in God, as one and the same being; and because God, or that which besides the Word and Spirit, is in God, is represented so, as that the Word is his; therefore we justly think, that so much of God, as is not, by a more particular name, distinguished from Word and Spirit in Scripture, and is conceived by us as prior, in consideration, to both Word and Spirit, is very properly termed the eternal Father of the Word, and the Word very properly term'd his Eternal Son.*

But since both these pretended reasons are equally apply'd by him to the *Word* and *Spirit*, they prove *both to be Sons*, or neither; and if the Doctor had dealt fairly, he would have said, therefore, that *prior* thing in God, &c. is very properly term'd, *the eternal Father* of the *Word* and *Spirit* both; and both *Word* and *Spirit* are very properly termed his *eternal Sons*. I dare appeal to him, if he did not see this, which is so manifest; and if he did not resolve to shew the matter thus partially: for, does the *Word* become God's *Son*, *because it subsists eternally in him*; and does not he say the same of the *Holy Spirit* expressly? Or is it *because* it is called the *Word of God*? And then is not the other much oftner called the *Spirit of God*? Is not this a brave foundation for building the relations of *Father* and *Son*, and the doctrine of the *eternal generation*, upon? If the Doctor had so well confuted, formerly, the notion of the *eternal procession*, he has here brought in the *eternal generation of the Spirit*, in the room of it.

So that upon the whole, having under the foregoing remark shewn that the expressions, viz. the *Word of God*, and *Spirit of God*, do not imply

ply any *third* thing in God, (upon the Doctor's supposition, that they are that God) which takes away his pretended ground of *Sonship*; I think I may adventure to say, that the Doctor has first supposed a *nameless Father*, and then assigned him *two Sons*, and this (as he grants) without any direct Scripture-warrant; and yet this he would have believed to be the *ever-blessed Trinity* of the Christian faith. Sorry I am that the sacred and awful names of the *Father*, the *Son*, and *Holy Spirit*, in the Gospel, should be thus sported with, and, I wish I may not say, wantonly misapply'd. And when he had, in this poor trifling manner, strained for some pretence to name the persons, *Father* and *Son*, methinks it had been enough to say, that, by some sort of *analogy*, one may adventure to speak of them so: but to say, *These are just thoughts of the divine nature*, and that for *these* reasons (which plainly are none) we may *properly so speak*; yea, and *very properly* too; is what I cannot well account for. The plain truth seems to me to be, that the Doctor could not make the express Scripture Trinity, of *God the Father*, and his *only-begotten Son Jesus Christ*, and the *Holy Spirit*, agree well with the common offices of the church; and therefore he contrived to bring all the same three names into the *first person*, where, under the name of *Son* (which has still the same sound, tho another sense) he can safely worship God the Father with that supreme adoration, which he could not give to the *Son of God*, as it is meant in the Scriptures: The Son of God, in the Gospel, signifying, as he thinks, only the *man Christ*, he must find, or make another Son, which is God; and then he can say of him all, that others say and intend of the *Scripture-Son of God*.

And now I dare appeal to any impartial and sober-minded man, whether the Doctor found this airy, lame, and inconsistent scheme of a Trinity in the holy Scripture, or brought his *hypothesis* with him, and contrived how to force and skrew the sacred *text* into a little seeming accommodation to it.

To conclude: As I am firmly persuaded the Doctor's notion of the *Trinity* is neither expressly affirmed, nor so much as intimated in our establish'd liturgy; so I cannot see how he can reconcile the passages therein relating to the Trinity, to his own sentiments; or how he can repeat his subscription, &c. with an honest integrity, (which yet I believe he greatly values) any more than Doctor Clarke can; or how he can use the *creeds* and *forms of devotion*, which, without a violent interpretation, must, I think, thwart the sense of his own mind. As for instance; can he, according to the *Albanasian* and *Nicene creeds*, believe the *Son of God*, who was *not made nor created, to be begotten before all worlds*; and this as a branch of the *catholic faith*, which the Scriptures teach; when so oft he declares, from the Scriptures, only the *man Christ* to be the *Son of God*, who was *made and created*; and that the *Word*, or divine nature, is never call'd *God's Son*, nor was ever *derived* or *begotten* at all of the very God, (however he might be termed *Son*, by some subtle strain, or mental reservation) but is that very *self-existent* God? Or else can he believe the *Holy Ghost* not to be begotten, when he has given no notion of the *Son's* filiation, but what belongs equally to the *Spirit*, as being, according to his account, as much *begotten*, as the *Word* or *Son* is? Can he heartily say, *God of God*, who owns no derivation

rivation of the *Son*? I imagine his sense of such passages will not be more tolerable, or less violent, than Dr. *Clarke's* interpretation appears to him to be.

And therefore if there be so much hardship on both sides, in subscribing and using the public offices and modern creeds; so that ingenious and considering men are put to their shifts (and the more considerate, the more hardly put to it) how to make them consist with their own sense, and the Scripture-accounts; I heartily wish the Doctor, and all such persons, worthy of respect for their very valuable abilities, and for their diligent consideration of religious matters, would in the most public manner use their interest to have these matters fairly examined, and as honestly amended, in a regular calm way, where there may appear just reason for it; in order to prevent the ensnaring or confounding mens minds in their holy devotions. Every man's head is not so able to carry a collection of nice *scholastic* distinctions to the church, and to handle them so dextrously, and apply them so nimbly to every article of a very *hard creed*, as Dr. *Bennet* may.

I would desire him to consider but that one thing, of *three persons and one God*, in the Litany, and creed call'd *Atbanasian*, what he thinks the people must mean by *three persons*? Himself confesses, *That in common speech, a person and an intelligent being are the same*; and that in the God-head there are not *three persons* in *this* sense. And yet neither he nor others do give us any *other* determinate sense to fix upon. Now, as one would think, that words in *common prayers* should be used, as taken in *common speech*, because people naturally will take them in the common

P. 321.

mon sense; so if there be no other determinate sense given them, I see not how they can avoid misunderstanding them; or how I can with hearty freedom use such words, which I expect will mislead their devotions, viz. from *one* God to *three*: And especially, if in the same *creed*, where I profess three *persons in God*, I use that word, *person*, as apply'd to one of the three, in the more common sense; it will be hard (having no other known sense of the word) to go both against the common sense, and the very sense of it in the same offices. And therefore the Doctor's inference, from his granting that the word *persons*, is not taken in the common sense, viz. *That therefore there is no reason to wrangle about a phrase*, is just the reverse of what should be; for *therefore* rather there is reason to except against what is out of the way of the people's apprehension, unless there be a weightier reason for it, than their edification.

I dare appeal to the Doctor's own candour in his most serious moments, if in the course of the prayers in the liturgy, the Church does not intend, under the character of *Father, heavenly Father*, and *everlasting Father*, to address to another person, than either the Doctor, or, by his account; the Scriptures intend by that name: for instead of the one self-existent God, in whom he says the holy Trinity is included, viz. the *God and Father* of the man the Lord Jesus Christ, &c. (and who is always meant by that relative character *Father* in Scripture, as he declares) the church intends plainly, in *many* instances (and so in the *rest* it will be presumed to be in one and the same uniform sense) to address to only *one* of the divine persons, as the Father, viz. in all those *Collects*, which end thus, *thro' Jesus Christ*

thy Son, who with thee (i. e. thee, the object of S. after our prayers) and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth ever one God. Is not thee, or the per- Christmas-day.
6. S. after Epiphany.
Septuagesima S.

And may it not be for this reason, that the church, with very great caution, has in the *communion rubric*, directed the usual words, *Holy Father*, to be omitted at the *Lord's table* on *Trinity Sunday*? perhaps lest the people should think they did not address all the *three* persons on that peculiar day; but on other days, it seems, there was not any such need of that caution. I know indeed the Doctor says, *That the P. 260. Father can't be worshipped separately from the Word*: but I think it appears, it may be intended by men to express their adoration of but one of the persons singly; tho the Doctor may intend all three persons, under the church's distinguishing character of one, *viz.* the *Father*.

Since then the Doctor cannot well approve such applications to God, I hope he is by this time convinced of some difficulty in interpreting many passages in the liturgy to *his own* sense, as well as Dr. Clarke, to his: only this may be said for the *latter*, that he is willing to have these things examined and reformed according to the original standard of Christianity; and owns his interpretation to be harsh. Let the Doctor then be like-minded, and not applaud such notions, as he confesses are not in Scripture expressly, (and I have shewn are not there implicitly, where he pretended it) *viz.* the relation of a *Father*, and an *eternal Son*, in the *one self-existent supreme God*. Let him not palliate and encourage what he has declared to be beside the sacred text, by saying
never-

nevertheless, it is *just thinking*, and *properly and very properly speaking*; and that he desires the use of such words in an uncommon (and so far a dangerous) sense, *may be continued till better be substituted*; but let him endeavour what he can to get *such* substituted by them on whom lies the *care of the church* for its edification. I hope he will seriously represent to them, how much more easy it will be to save the public offices, and the ministry from disrespect, when none shall suspect any of subscribing or using such forms of devotion, as thwart the true sense of their unbiass'd minds.

P. 264. I may conceive the more hopes of this from the reverend Doctor, who is not so bound up by old prejudices, nor past decisions of *synods*, nor by a superstitious reverence for what the church professes; but that he will oppose a doctrine inconsistent with the holy Scriptures, *if our church did never so expressly affirm it*. 'Tis honestly and generously spoken: And I must acknowledge he has not evil-entreated others, who use the same liberty, but with Christian candor and breeding has pleaded his own cause.

And tho I cannot find the *select topics* mention'd in his *Preface*, which *shall convince the best understandings, and satisfy every reader*, because I myself, being among the latter, am not satisfy'd by his arguments; yet shall I be very glad if this, or his other zealous services done or intended for the church, may gain him such esteem and influence with his *reverend brethren of the Clergy*, as may render him of great use to promote the truth, and to *rectify some things*, more than he has rectify'd Dr. Clarke's *nations of the Trinity*; that so by approving ourselves to God, in a sincere love of *the truth*, and by an honest
manifestation

manifestation of that truth, commending ourselves to the consciences of men, as in the sight of God, we may, all of us, come to the unity of the faith (as I hope we shall, after all our diversity of thoughts in these matters) and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; that so, with joyful harmonious concord, we may give blessing, and honour, and glory, to Him who sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever. Amen.



The

P <i>PRIDE of Reason, in affecting subtle and sublime mysteries, instead of the plain simplicity of the Gospel.</i>	page 304, 5
<i>Dr. Bennet's commendation for the manner of his writing.</i>	305
<i>What texts are given up, particularly Phil. 2. 6.</i>	308
<i>The Doctor contends not with Dr. Clarke about the Baptismal Creed, or Trinity, but another Trinity.</i>	312
<i>The Doctor's notion of the Word's quiescence.</i>	313
<i>The man Christ Jesus the first-born of the creation.</i>	315
<i>The great humiliation of the Logos.</i>	320
<i>Irenæus favours not the Doctor's notion.</i>	322
<i>Presumptions against his notion of the quiescence.</i>	323
<i>John 1. 1. The Word was God, explained.</i>	331
<i>A known distinction in that text between the God, and a God.</i>	333
<i>Heb. 1. 10. Not certainly said of the Son, but rather of God the Father.</i>	339
<i>The personality of the Holy Spirit given up.</i>	342
<i>The main question about the Holy Spirit's Deity, refers only to the personal Spirit, not to the power of God.</i>	345
<i>1 Cor. 2. 10, 11. cleared.</i>	346
<i>A Trinity of Three Fathers imply'd by Dr. Bennet.</i>	350
<i>His Three Persons but operations.</i>	351
<i>At other times they are Three Beings.</i>	352
<i>No Trinity but only Two Persons in his scheme.</i>	354
<i>The characters of the Two Persons confounded.</i>	357
<i>Inconsistency of his notions with the offices of the church.</i>	359, 360
<i>The church's caution, in the communion-rubric.</i>	363

REMARKS

On a BOOK, intitled,

*The Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity
Stated and Defended,*

BY

Four LONDON-MINISTERS,

Mr. TONG, | Mr. SMITH, and
Mr. ROBINSON, | Mr. REYNOLDS.

WITH AN

A P P E N D I X,

Concerning

*The Equality of the Three Persons, and
Mr. JURIEU's Testimony to the Pri-
mitive Doctrine in this point.*

Hilar. de Synodis. *O beatos vos in domino, & gloriosos, qui
Apostolicam fidem conscientia retinentes, conscriptas Fides hac
usque nescitis.* Happy ye, who retain the perfect Apostolic
Creed, and own no other Forms of Faith.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

Remarks on Mr. Tong's Introduction.

CHAP. II.

On Mr. Robinson's State of the question, and explanation and proof of the Trinity.

CHAP. III.

On Mr. Smith's Harmony of confessions.

CHAP. IV.

On Mr. Reynolds's Advices.

APPENDIX,

Concerning the equality of the Three Persons, with Mr. Jurieu's testimony to the primitive doctrine in this point.



REMARKS *on a Book, intitled,*
The Doctrine of the Blessed Tri-
nity stated and defended, &c.

INTRODUCTION.

THIS effort from the united strength of Four, and them of no less a character than LONDON-MINISTERS, and speedily recommended by a brother for *most eminent Ministers**, will give no uneasiness, I think, * Cum- to their adversaries, nor any way endanger their ming's cause with such as understand it. But since the Advice, hope of these united defenders of the vulgar no-^{p. 7.} tions, or rather their *phrases*, is, that some honest *unsettled* minds of their party and *denomination* may with more attention bearken to their old acquaintance, they are willing to try what they can do upon the score of friendship, *p. 2.* And accordingly, the Gentleman in the rear has applied hard to their passions, with the flattering carnal persuasions of a friend, rather than to their judgments and consciences with the honesty of a faithful guide, as we shall see hereafter.

Now, to prevent their abusing the weakness of their honest bewildred friends by deceitful arts, and by creating imaginary horrors in the dark, I judge it not amiss to give a short and general account of the performance of each of the Four. And tho I may sometimes speak of them singly, as each has done his part, yet I shall usually join them together in the plural number: for

since they are in confederacy, and each writes in the name of all with mutual approbation, I reckon they stand bound *jointly and severally* to answer for the whole.

C H A P. I.

On Mr. Tong's Introduction.

MR. Tong is set first to smoothe the way with soft and supple words, with professions of great humility, tenderness, and charity, and reverend regard to the sacred Scriptures: but it is not without some instances, now and then, of smooth deceitful turns. He insinuates, *pag. 1.* *That it is too true to be denied, and too manifest to be conceal'd by them, that some among themselves who have been trained up to have the greatest value for Scripture-revelation, have been wrought upon to call in question an article of faith fully and frequently asserted both in the Old and New Testament.* It should seem by this, that those whom he has in view, are gone off from their *value of Scripture-revelation*, and therefore reject what is fully asserted in the Old and New Testament. Now this was not so manifest, but that if he had concealed it, it had been still unheard of by me, and many others: but if he intends by this to reproach those men who like not *his*, or his brethren's explanations of the *Trinity*, it is an unrighteous slander upon them, who express a much greater value for the sacred Scriptures, than those who esteem the *Assembly's Catechism* and *Confession* far better vouchers of a man's orthodox faith, than the Bible. And if those whom he thus defames, reject his and his brethren's human composures, it is because they are unscriptural, and asserted neither in the Old nor New Testament. And therefore,

fore, let him be as *forward* as he pleases to *suspect* them, they hold fast to the *Oracles of God*, among whose first principles, that of *three persons*, and them the *one God*, hath no place in the Apostle's enumeration of them, *Heb. 6. 1.* Nor do any of them, that I know, question the *proper* (for he does not say the supreme) *Godhead of Jesus Christ*, which he begins with; but they readily grant, that the *Son* has his *proper* Godhead, and the *Father* his *proper* Godhead also, if that will give satisfaction.

I blame not his zeal, *p. 4.* in a charitable contention for the *faith once* (or of old) *delivered to the Saints*, which is in the sacred Writings; but what is this to the *new faith* and *form* of later ages, tho there were ten thousand of them? His brethren are as zealous as he in contending for the *faithful Word taught by the Apostles*, and for convincing such *gain-sayers* as would impose another *rule* and *test* of faith and Christian communion than the safe and sure word of Christ: *Let that dwell richly in us*; and if we have not a word of the *Assembly's Catechism*, we may yet do very well.

This smooth Gentleman, I am loth to say, creeps in unawares, *p. 5.* to *deny the only Lord God*, by giving away his title to another: but he gives a very perverting turn of the text, *Jude 4.* for instead of *denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ*, he would make but one person of the whole, by rendring it thus; *denying that only sovereign God and Lord of ours, Jesus Christ.* As if Jesus Christ was the *only sovereign God*; notwithstanding his own words, *John 17. 3.* giving that character to his Father only; who alone is said to be *the God* in that sense wherein there is but *one God*, *1 Cor. 8. 6.* But as the word *dominus, Lord*, is never certainly once ap-

plied to *Jesus Christ*; (whence good critics have concluded, that passage, *2 Pet. 2. 1. denying the Lord that bought them*, can belong only to God the Father, who ransom'd them; answerable to *Deut. 32.*) so the text itself here plainly distinguishes two persons, the *Lord God*, and the *Lord Christ*; why else is the character of *Lord* doubled? As well he might turn the words *1 Cor. 1. 3.* (and other like texts) thus, *viz. Grace be to you from that God our Father and Lord, even Jesus Christ.* To be sure this is a strong and clear way of proving *Jesus Christ* to be the one only God! But coming from *true friends*, it may perhaps do with some *old acquaintance*; tho such doubtful strained interpretations will never determine others that are but indifferent before.

I am glad to find him, in the name of his brethren, condemning the *use of external force in matters of religion*, p. 3. I wish they may continue in that mind long. But methinks this does not well agree with their pretended triumphs over error, p. 7. which, tho it is sily enough passed over there, were, we know, the conquests of earthly power, and the triumphs of cruelty and violence. So the beast *made war with the witnesses, and overcame and killed 'em*, *Rev. 11. 7.* We consider, when presently after the Reformation some stood up to revive opinions dishonourable to our *Lord Jesus Christ*, say our authors, *God raised up others to oppose them; and after some struggle, the true faith prevailed, and error fell before it.* But surely, if they had consider'd it well, they would never have encouraged themselves by such examples; for with what opposition was it that these errors fell, and their *faith prevailed*? Was it not by carnal weapons, by blood, slaughter, and fire? So *Servetus* fell; and so *Calvin* prevailed by help of a capital edict the year before that execution;

execution; and so *Valent. Gentilis* fell in *Bern*; and so *Cranmer* here prevailed against some whom he got to be burnt for *Arians* in *King Edward VI's* reign: but behold, when his own turn came to endure the like, he grievously retracted; and if he died a martyr, it was when his *apostasy* would not procure his deliverance. Bishop *Burnet* has made a remark on such persecuting practices of the first reformers: they were generally violent patrons for *external force in matters of religion*; they wrote openly in defence of it*. And was their example such an encouraging consideration to these LONDON-MINISTERS, and fit to be glory'd in? If the methods of such as *Calvin* and *Beza*, and others at home, are their encouragement, we must fear the meaning of it under all these soft words; *the voice indeed is Jacob's*. —

Hist. of
Refor. l. 2.

Next we are told of the success (ascribed by them to God) against *those errors*, during the confusions of the civil wars in *England*, by books and *public disputations appointed*. Now I remember one such disputation was appointed between *Mr. Biddle* (see his *Life*) and one *John Griffin* a pastor of some called *Anabaptists*: but before the second day for disputation came, *Mr. Biddle* was clapt up in prison, and was afterward banish'd into the isles of *Scilly*: and so error fell once more.

The next boasted period, is the reign of the glorious *King William*; when the *Antitrinitarians* took heart, and grew numerous; when they met with opposition from *Dr. Stillingfleet*, and the two *Edwards's*, &c. whose labours were a seasonable service

A a 3

* Ut, quo quisque modo volet, colat deum, est dogma merè diabolicum, i. e. That every one should worship God as he likes best, is a devilish tenet — and a devilish liberty. *Beza* Epist. ad *Dudithium*. T. E.

service to the church of God. But King William was not willing to be made a persecutor, tho the dissenters lay hard at him, in their address by Dr. Bates, to stop the press, anno 1697. And therefore, tho one discouraging act was passed, the *Antitrinitarians* continued to grow numerous still, for all that Dr. Stillingfleet, and many more, could do by writing. And if I am not deceiv'd, that learned bishop acquitted himself so indifferently in the controversy against Mr. Locke, that he had as little satisfaction himself, as he had success with others, in meddling in that matter.

Once again, The last encouraging precedent, these ministers set before them, is the *speedy and effectual stop put to these errors in Dublin by the solid and close reasonings of their reverend brother, Mr. Boyse*. This is a pretty fresh instance, in which the world cannot easily be imposed on by a deceitful relation; it refers to my own case. Now, it is well known by what means a stop was put to the open and free spreading of my book and arguments in *Dublin*; it was done immediately by *the solid and close reasoning* of the Lord Chief Justice's warrant for seizing the *Author* and impression, and so suppressing the books; and by binding *him* over to his trial, in order to *a fine and close imprisonment*. Here was some stop indeed put; but it is hoped and believed *these close and solid reasonings* were not at all of their brother *Boyse's* contriving, tho of some other dissenters. But to insinuate that Mr. *Boyse's* book did the work, is a gross piece of deceit in such who know better; how that it was done long before *he* wrote, and that after the *Author* was fast bound, and most of the books suppress'd, then their brother fell upon him. And indeed, if his close reasoning had such mighty success, how comes

comes it to pass, that when reprinted at *London*, it could put no effectual stop, early or late, to these *pretended errors* here? I suppose the *reasoning* was as solid on this side the water, as on the other; only there wanted the solid reasons of goal and *external force*, and so it fail'd of success. These ministers knew it was more taking and credible to impute the effect to solid *reasoning*, than to the magistrate's *terror*; and therefore, tho not very honestly, seem willing to use a little deceit to disguise the matter.

So that here is scarce one period of time referred to, nor instance of the success so much boasted of, given us, but where *violence* and *cruelty* seem to have done more in the case than *truth* and *argument*: and I would ask these gentlemen, if ever they knew *Arianism*, or even popery, failed of some success, when they had such solid arguments in their cause, and their advocates could dispute with *legions* at their beck? And since they stick not to tell us, that it is from such precedents as these that they take their encouragement and pattern, and rejoice and boast in them, they ought not to wonder, as in *pag. 5.* if they hear it already suggested that they are ready to use carnal weapons too, if they had them in their power: for it is not from a want of candor and charity, as is insinuated, or from presuming to know the heart, but because men come to this knowledge by a fair and *rational deduction*: and therefore if they do wrong them in their *conclusion*, (which I can willingly hope to be so) yet I am sure they ought to find very easy forgiveness, from those who have unawares laid down such *premises* as will naturally infer it. And tho I will not charge them with the consequences which themselves so expressly renounce, yet I wish they had been so ingenuous as not to triumph in such

instances of success, which was gained by those methods they professedly condemn, and not at all by such methods as they here propound to take.

As to their brethren who are changing their principles, they advise them, p. 12. to be free and open in all places, and that when pressed with their real sentiments by those that are dissatisfied, they will not raise an artificial cloud of ambiguous phrases, and so get off for the present; and this in order to preserve sound and entire their sincerity.

Now, if I mistake not, this advice (if they have the same regard as their brethren for sincerity) will equally touch these gentlemen, and the brethren of the subscribing party, to the quick: for I find they are as good artists at reserve in their faith, and hate to be open and free when pressed to declare whether they hold Father, Son, and Spirit, to be but *one* Infinite Spirit, or *three*; that is, indeed, whether they be *three* infinite Gods, (as others judge of it, according to their *Catechism's* definition of a God, tho they will not say this) or *one*. This must be a very important point, and I wonder it should be a question whether it be so or not; for to mistake one infinite, eternal, unchangeable Spirit, &c. for three such, must introduce the greatest confusion and falsehood into our conceptions, affections and devotions: nay, to worship one supreme God the Father, and another subordinate Lord, or God, *Heb. i. 8.* cannot make so wide a difference from them who hold but *one* supreme God and a *Mediator*, as to worship *three* co-ordinate equal Gods or infinite Spirits; so that it will be hardly possible, by these ministers principles, for them to worship God together with a good conscience, p. 13. But,

Why

Why then do not these men declare *freely and openly in all companies* what their faith is in this matter? whether they believe in three eternal minds, or but one? and if they have not divided enough already, make another subdivision, and exclude *Sabellians* or *Tritheists*? 'Tis hypocrisy to strain at a gnat and swallow a camel; to cast out them called *Arians*, and to admit worse. No, no, let 'em put this question home, and come to a scrutiny, if their zeal be sincere and uniform; or let 'em declare themselves when they are pressed; let 'em be honest and open, if they please.

Instead of this, when pressed, I hear these men are either sullen or reserved and raise *artificial clouds* to get off; and pray to be excused, tho it be in as plain and important a case as the other, in which they will not excuse their brethren. Let them purge themselves here, or they will be but ill advisers to sincerity in others. If they say they are not clear in this, nor pretend to know it, then I pray let others have the benefit of their doubts also, in other points: yet methinks 'tis scarce credible they should not be clear in what they do hold here; for can they worship Father, Son, and Spirit, and not know whether they intend to direct it to *three* intelligent Beings that hear them, or but *one*? The Words, *One God*, may be variously explained by them; but their own *ideas* are determined one way or other, if they pray with any understanding at all: if not, surely they may bear with *joint confusion* of devotions, when they have each so much of it *singly* in himself; and should forbear to ask others too many questions, till they have asked (and answered) themselves this great question, *Do I address to one infinite Power and Wisdom, or to three that are alike infinite?* I am sure 'tis a very serious

serious and needful question for every man to put to his own heart, when he bows his knee in worship.

These Authors seem, p. 13. to lay the great stress of the matter in debate on this, *viz.* Whether the *Son and Spirit be of the same substance with the Father?* Which is to abuse the world, by setting them to dispute about what they know nothing of, and is one of the *needless and dangerous explications*, which p. 22. they call a *Snare*, and which does not concern their happiness. I think the great and concerning question is, whether the *Son and Spirit* have the very same *dignity and authority*, the same *dominion* and same *relation* to us as the *Father* has, or at least *as great* as his when compared together. This we may learn from Scripture, and by this our esteem and duty is to be guided. Our duty is not grounded on notions of philosophy about God's *substance*, but on God's dominion over us, his interest in, his benefits to, and government of us, let his substance be whatsoever it is.

'Tis a strange assertion, p. 14. *That the God-head of the Holy Spirit should be thought the primary article of revealed religion*, and yet that he should never once be called *God* in that revelation, nor we his servants, or church, nor once bid to praise or pray to him, or to ascribe glory and dominion to him. And so I leave Mr. Tong's Introduction.

CHAP. II.

On Mr. Robinson's State of the Question and explication and proof of the Trinity.

HE says, p. 16. his Opponents and the Ministers fully agreed that there *is none other God but one*, 1 Cor. 8. 4. True, 'tis agreed so in words;

words; but 'tis argued that yet in very deed such *Trinitarians* do set up three Gods, *equal in power and glory*, by their doctrine, whatever be done in their unexpressible confused thoughts. Their adversaries maintain they can shew one complete, supreme, all-perfect God, who is not the *Son*, nor *Spirit*, but *distinct* from both: *There is one Spirit, one Lord, and one God and Father of all, who is in all, &c. Eph. 4. 4, 5, 6.* And therefore if *there be but one who is God, and no other but he*, they conclude they have found him in the *Father*, and that no other but he can be that Supreme God.

But his next paragraph is intolerably assuming, false, and uncharitable; for, p. 17. he says, That next to the question, *Who or what this one God is?* he fears the main question between us will be found to be, *Whether the Divine Being is not more clearly and fully known to these very wise men, than to the all-wise G O D himself? at least, Whether they are not able to speak more just than he has thought fit to do of himself in the sacred Scriptures.*

Here is a dreadful crime indeed, of the highest magnitude, charged on his brethren. What! can any man living be guilty of this more than *Luciferian* pride, viz. to think or to doubt that he may possibly know the Almighty to greater perfection than he knows himself? Are there such among his brethren? I can't think there is such a monster on earth. To question the divine Being, is not so absurd as to suppose I am wiser than he. Surely there should be good evidence of this astonishing wickedness and folly charged on his brethren; the rather, because 'tis so incredible, as well as so abominable.

But if never any one of them propounded such a doubt, nay, never had such a doubt in them,
but

but truly believed and professed they knew not the great God fully as himself does; and therefore cared not to speak, or require others to speak of him, but in his own, *i. e.* the *Scripture expressions*, for fear they should talk foolishly, and not so *justly and exactly* as he has spoken of himself: I say, if this be the real truth, then what an unrighteous slander, nay what a cruel and false insinuation is this; and that from one who professes to be serious in religion? Perhaps he will hearken to his preceding brother's words on a thousand-fold less occasion, *p. 4.* This is a *specimen of some mens singular candor and charity for us: we wish they would consider whose prerogative they now assume, and what is become of that modesty and tenderness, of which they have been used to speak. Do they come by this knowledge of us by rational deduction?* Their brethren have never given, I believe, any real ground for this worst of calumpnies, but quite the contrary, by chusing to have no test of faith in the *Trinity*, but the *Scripture express words*.

And 'tis still more intolerable and disingenuous, if this so black an accusation, laid upon others, shall be found to come from *such* as have acted suitably to that very principle they falsely reproach others with; and from *such* too as have been passionately offended with their brethren, for acting so as to avoid the suspicion of presuming to speak more exactly of God than the sacred *Scriptures* do, and for their not hearkning to these very *wise men*, who would have drawn 'em into a probable suspicion of that crime they still charge 'em with: I say, if these very ministers, as if indeed they were able to speak more justly of God than himself has done, did urge their brethren to subscribe *strange explications* of the *Trinity*, and words of *human wisdom*; and if
their

their brethren, as humbly judging none can speak so wisely of God as himself, refused it: if this indeed be the case, I must be astonish'd at the uncharitable injurious confidence of these very men, to charge 'em so falsely (not only without, but against plain and open evidence) with a crime; to keep themselves clear whereof, they are forced to endure the displeasure, if not abandon the communion of these brethren, their unrighteous accusers. Had they said indefinitely, this was the great *question* between their brethren and others, Whether men might know and speak more justly of the great God, than himself? &c. it had perhaps rather been thought currently, that really these ministers had owned the thing, and taken that side of the question to themselves, which their unscriptural tests and impositions are so fully correspondent to, and had wrought in many a jealousy of: but to turn it upon the haters and opposers of it, is not so much art, as something else, which is more amazing. By this one may see with what spirit this was written.

'Tis a vain suggestion, p. 23. That the Scripture says *not any where*, *That the Father alone (exclusive of all others) is the one God*; when we find it so often, *John* 17. 3. *1 Cor.* 8. 4, 5, 6. *Eph.* 4. 6. but never find that the *three* are the one God.

They tell us, p. 21. *We, who have no notion of a greater or lesser in the Godhead, do think, that wherever that belongs, it must equally belong; and consequently, that 'tis not any one of the three, but that these three are the one Supreme God.*

Methinks they who can form no notion of (and therefore reject) a *greater* and *less* in the Godhead, or of different degrees of comparison in the *supreme* God, should find it as hard (and therefore not own) to have any notion of *equals*,

i. e. of any comparison at all, in the *one* God: I think the *unity* may as much exclude *equality*; as the *supremacy* exclude *inferiority*. If they have such a notion of *equals* in *one* God, I hope they will let us know it; if they have none, that they will not maintain one point, of which they have no notion, when they for this reason disown the other: and whether it be a consequence or not, I think it a bold word, that *not any one* of the three is the *one supreme* God. It seems then the *God and Father of our Lord Christ*, is not the *one only true* God, tho the Apostle says he is *the one God and Father*, &c. Eph. 4. 6. *ὁ Θεός*; then it must be said, *Christ is not the supreme* God, and that *the supreme* God *was not incarnate*, for the Son is but *one* of the three; and that when we worship the Son to the *glory of the Father*, Phil. 2. 11. 'tis not to the glory of the *one supreme* God. It used to be said, that *each* has the *whole essence*, and is perfect God; but with these men, *not any one* of them is the *one* God. So that we worship not the *one* God by Christ, unless we worship Christ himself thro' himself.

One would think they should see, how the Christian Religion is abused by such notions; and that men of such tender and dark schemes (fram'd upon *consequences*, as they say) should not push for a scrutiny, nor be rough in pressing others to approve 'em. Are these the *plain Scripture consequences that are to be regarded as revelation*? Is this the *one determinate sense of Scripture* which all must agree in, or be excluded their communion? Many will be ready to say, *To their assembly, my soul, be not united*, if they renounce the first article of their creed, *I believe in the one God the Father*.

Nay.

Nay, if I mistake not, they herein contradict the very articles of the Church of England, and the *Athanasian Creed*, which they have subscribed in courts of public record; for the second article says expressly, that in the person of Christ there are joined two whole and perfect natures, i. e. the whole and perfect godhead, and whole manhood; and yet I think neither the *Father* nor *Spirit* are supposed to be so personally joined, but the *Son* only. It says also, that the *Son, the Word of the Father, is the very and eternal God*. I suppose this means the one supreme God, which these men deny any one of the three to be. And the *Athanasian* creed says, that each Person by himself is God, i. e. without including the other two.

Now, if fidelity to their public confessions made 'em so forward to repeat voluntarily their subscription to the first article, and to urge it on their brethren; then why not to this second article also, and to the eighth? Why do they not propound the *Athanasian Creed* for a test? or do they all agree, that 'tis fitter for a chymist than a Christian? Their fidelity to their subscriptions and confessions is not glorious enough to be boasted of (p. 8.) if they rest in such a lame defective declaration as this, viz. for one article only, when yet there are several more, relating to the same subject, which I doubt they gainsay in these words, *Not any of the three is the one supreme God*.

'Tis said by 'em, *We pretend not to say how these three are distinguished from each other, but leave it to those who are bold enough to speak of it without the Scriptures*.

But then, who are they that are so bold as to say, they are distinguished as three Persons, and yet do not say whether as three Beings? And 'tis for this reason the hard name of *Sabellianism*.

is put upon some of 'em, as due to those who hold, that *Father, Son, and Spirit*, are but the same one *numerical Being*, and so by necessary consequence, all alike incarnate; the divine nature of the Father, as much as that of the Son, if it be one and the same under both names*. For, he who says the *Father's* infinite divine nature is not incarnate, and that the *Son's* is so, says indeed (not by remote unseen consequence, but) directly, that there are *two* infinite divine natures, one that *is*, and one that is *not*; or he speaks open contradictions, too gross, I doubt, to leave room for the charitable plea, that *he does not see it*. And I presume, the subscribing imposing party of *Salter's-hall-Meeting* may subdivide again as hotly as before, whenever their zeal of contending for the faith shall direct to a new test to find out who are for *one*, and who for *three* infinite minds.

And if they are so cautious and modest, *not to say how these three are distinguished*, how came they to be so bold to say how they are *united*, viz. into one God? since they cannot produce half the Scripture-evidence for their being all three *the one God*, as there appears to be, for their being *three distinct minds* or spirits: neither the one nor the other are said in express terms, either that they *three are the one God*, or that *they are three persons*. And it seems themselves tacitly confess, they know not whether they are *one infinite*

* The *Tautoousians* and *Monousians*, or they who held one and the *self-same being*, were condemn'd as *Sabellians* by the *Homousians*, i. e. by those that held the Father and Son to be *consubstantial*; οἱ Σαβιλλιανοὶ μονούσιον, καὶ ἕκ ὁμοούσιον, i. e. the *Sabellians* say *the same substance*, not *consubstantial*. *Athanas. de expof. fidei*. So *Epiphan. Har.* 76. So that the *numerical unity* of one single essence of the *three Persons*, was antiently accounted a grievous heresy, tho' the *specifical unity* was allowed. T. E.

infinite Spirit or not, by their not venturing to declare in this fundamental, *when press'd*, whether they believe them to be one or three such : that is, as others think, whether they are united as *one* God, or as *three* in reality, tho they abhor the latter in words. And indeed if they were but agreed in this grand point, I don't think they want *boldness* enough to say it.

But, to tell the truth, they are no more agreed about the *unity* of the three, than about their *distinction*, which also they acknowledge ; for the one is connected with the other : and if they can't say whether they are distinguish'd as three minds, or not, then they can't say neither whether they are united in an *union* of three infinite minds, or in the single *unity* of one : so that they cannot yet tell what they mean by the words *one God*, under which phrase they worship different objects, as 'tis differently understood by the *Sabelians* and *Tritheists*. And yet this confusion of devotion, it seems, does not hinder these scrupulous men from joining in the same worship, while they are so cautious to exclude others, who as much agree with each of them, as they among themselves.

And are not these fit men to prescribe to their brethren, and to cast out of communion such as differ from *them* in some notions or expressions, who know not their own mind, at least will not be so *sincere*, as freely and openly to tell it, in the greatest article of all religion, natural and revealed, *viz.* the *unity of God*? So that it seems to be rather humour and misguided passion in the case, than any rational grounds they have to go upon. For why may there not as easily be conceived an union of *subordinate* beings into one, as of three *co-ordinate* into one? Therefore let 'em be no more presumptuous in one point

than in the other. Their brethren, I hope, are modest, and humbly content to keep to the Scripture ; but *they*, I think, are the presuming men, who affect to be wise above what is written, and to equal their lame consequences and inferences with the sacred text, and who press rigorously to have the one determinate sense of Scripture in fundamentals received by all, while they have no determinate sense themselves, either of the divine *Unity*, or of the *Trinity*.

They seem to threaten us with some future discovery that they have in design, which will make us alter our notions of the term *Father* in the Scripture, p. 22. *Perhaps*, say they, *they may hereafter see reason to agree with us, that the term [Father] does not every where denote the person so called, but is oft to be understood of the divine essence absolutely considered.* It seems then *they* are already agreed in it, that the *Father* does not always denote *him* who is called *Father*, (that is something hard) but it means something that is either no *person* at all, (as if there were any such essence or intelligent nature that is no person) but a mere abstracted metaphysical notion, or else is all *three* persons together ; so that the *Father* shall signify *him* who is, or rather *them* who are *Father*, and *Son*, and *Holy Spirit* together, or any *one* of 'em singly, according as they shall have occasion for it to make out their scheme ; and then they may be gentlemen of a *new scheme* too.

What wretched work will these men make with the gospel ? The term *God* they have thus confounded already ; it must be, with them, sometimes the *divine essence* abstractly considered, sometimes *all three persons*, sometimes only the *Father*, sometimes the *Son*, and sometimes only the

the *Holy Spirit*, without any marks of distinction, but what their fancies suggest. Now it seems here is not confusion enough already, but we must have the word *Father* too, to pass thro' all the same varieties of sense, (and indeed the terms *Father* and *God* stick so close, that they will go together;) and I judge it will be as easy to prove the *Son* to stand for the *everlasting Father*, and for the *Spirit* too; and the *Spirit* to be a common name to all the three persons. And so each of the three, at this rate, standing for *all* the three, or for *any* of the three, will make so many changes, that it will be hard if men *hereafter* should be at a loss to defend all *schemes* and hypotheses, or to agree in any. Thus these gentlemen are consulting the edification of the Church, and the reputation of the sacred Scriptures after a brave manner! What will they make the Bible signify in this way, when no man shall know what *God*, and *Father*, and *Christ*, stand for? This is making Christianity a sport of words, and will give more occasion for Mr. *Smith*, than he had, p. 46. to say, *What, use may they say, can such a book be of, or what likelihood that it is from God?* And all this from a vain affectation of increasing mysteries, and despising the plain easy sense of the gospel, and the simplicity of the antient *Creed*, in comparison of the modern scholastic harmony, of no value nor regard in this case.

Nay, this position of theirs is contrary to one of the creeds in their harmony, p. 64. which says the *name Father is proper to the Father*, therefore not common to the *three*. I now come to his evidence.

This evidence is *first* from the Old Testament, p. 24. whence some things belonging there to the

supreme God, as he thinks, are applied to Christ in the *New*.

(1.) Because God, the *great God*, says, that the *Israelites tempted me*, *Psal.* 95. 9. and the Apostle, *1 Cor.* 10. 9. says, *Let us not tempt Christ, as they tempted*; he would infer that Christ was that same great God *above all Gods*. Whereas, *first*, 'tis not said by the Apostle that they *tempted Christ* at all; and some copies, instead of *Christ* in the first part of the text, read *God*. Nor, *secondly*, is it certain that 'tis the same temptation which in that *psalm* is referred to. Nor, *thirdly*, if it were so, that they tempted Christ as God's angel, acting in his person and *name*, from heaven, (while *Moses* was his servant on earth) is it at all strange they should be said to tempt God therein, tho another being above him. They might tempt both in the same act at once; as he who believed on Christ, *believed therein on him that sent him*, and yet not the same person, *John* 12. 44, 45. and he that despised the *Apostles*, *despised Jesus Christ*, *Luke* 10. 16. and *also despised him that sent him*: And yet God, Christ, and the Disciples, are not therefore all the same being, but subordinate to each other. 'Tis a shame these things so plain, should be told men so oft over again, without some fair answer.

Exam. of
Dr. Ben-
net.
Vol. II.
p. 340.

(2.) He imagines that from *Psalms* 102. the Apostle applies to Christ what was said of the supreme God, *Heb.* 1. 10, 11. And yet that author does not clearly appear, to apply it to Christ at all, to them who shall carefully inspect the place; but that 'tis rather a rapture of admiration upon the immutability of Christ's God, who had *anointed him a God*, and promised him a permanent kingdom *for ever*, which an immutable God was capable of performing.

(3.)

(3.) He says, *that* God so loftily described, *Psal.* 68. is Jesus Christ. Why so? Only because the 18th verse, *Thou hast ascended on high, &c.* is applied to Jesus Christ, *Eph.* 4. 8. *When he ascended on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts to men.* But tho this may be an allusion to the text, yet 'tis no direct citation of it as 'tis in the *psalm*; for there 'tis *thou* hast ascended, not *he*; and *thou receivedst gifts for men*, not *he gave gifts to men* *. And yet after all, it appears not that the *Psalmist* speaks there of the great God, but rather turns off by a sudden prophetic *apostrophe*, to speak these words concerning Christ, as another subject; which appears from these last words of the verse, *Thou hast ascended, &c. Thou hast received gifts for men, that the Lord might dwell among them.* Where 'tis plain the Lord God (by his own way of reasoning) is distinct from the person spoken to: Nor could God be properly said to ascend, or to receive gifts; so that it seems spoken directly to Jesus Christ, by breaking off the former discourse concerning God.

(4.) Once more, he says the Lord, whom *Isaiab* saw, *ch.* 6. 1. was Jesus Christ, because 'tis said *Isaiab* then saw *his*, i. e. *Christ's glory*, *John* 12. 41. But 'tis not said he saw Christ's glory, for *his glory* may refer to the *Lord*, which is the antecedent; and therefore many copies have it the *glory of God*, τῆ θεοῦ, and some of *his God*. And yet how even that glory might be Christ's, the reader may find satisfaction in consulting Dr. *Clarke* on that text, in his *Reply to Mr. Nelson*, p. 156.

B b 3

But

* Denique non hic quærenda est scrupulosè literalis Psalmi expositio, quum tantum ad Prophetæ verba alludat Paulus. Calvin in locum. i. e. The Apostle only alludes to the *Psalmist's* words, as he bends also *Moses's* words to his purpose, *Rom.* 10. 6. T. E.

But 'tis strange men should think to prove a fundamental of the Christian religion chiefly by dark inferences from some uncertain allusions to words in the *Old Testament*, and so to bring in the prime articles of our faith at some *back-door*, which one would expect should directly meet us at the very entrance.

His *New-Testament evidence* of the Trinity is a heap of texts, which are not to the purpose, unless he could make good his own interpretation of 'em, against the many strong reasons that have been produc'd again and again in most of the particulars; which yet he attempts not, as if he had never heard of them. What signifies it to interpret the *great God*, Tit. 2. 14. the *true God*, 1 John 5. 20. the *Almighty*, Rev. 1. 8. of Jesus Christ, p. 26, 27. when he may know 'tis not allowed by many of their own side? And is it not a weak thing for one to imagine to convince gain-sayers, by such proofs as don't at all satisfy many of his own party, as may be seen in their comments, &c.? [Dr. Bennet on the *Trinity*, ch. 6, 8, &c.] This is trifling with understanding men, and deceiving the weak and ignorant.

The *name*, the *works*, the *worship*, the *powers*, ascribed in Scripture to the Lord Jesus Christ, are all chearfully acknowledged by those who think him subordinate to the Father, without whom he says he could of *himself* do nothing, *John* 5. 31. We know he wrought great miracles, and *healed the diseased* with a word, *because God was with him*, *Acts* 10. 38. And 'tis not true to say he *neither did nor needed to refer to another name*, nor *was enabled by a derived power*, p. 29. when he directly says, *My Father in me doth the works*, *John* 14. 10. and that he came in *his Father's name*, *John* 5. 43. and thereby his Father bore *witness of him*, ver. 37. We own God by him
created

created the worlds ; and that God has appointed him to judge the world as a man, sufficiently enabled for it by God, *the judge of all* ; and to receive adoration and glory ; *Amen*, so be it ! Let every knee bow to him, to the ultimate *glory of God the Father*. Phil. 2. 11. The ministers could not be ignorant how all these matters are satisfactorily accounted for by their opposers, in the judgment of very many ; and therefore should have argued this point better, or have said nothing. But perhaps it was not proper to be told to their friends, that any thing was to be said against these arguments.

They have said more than they bring any appearance of proof of, in saying that in *the oracles of God, the Son has in all points the same glory given to him with the Father*, p. 23. What ! has he then the same glory of doing every thing of himself ? Has he the same glory of *knowing the day* of judgment, as the Father ? Has he the glory of the Father's worship, being referred to *his* honour as the last end ? Has he the glory of creating all things by the Father, or of putting all things under him ? Has he the glory of being the God of the *Father*, as the Father is the *God and Father of the Lord Christ* ? Has the Son the glory of being worshipped thro' a Mediator ? No surely. And yet we don't hold this Lord *Jesus*, whom God has anointed, to be an *imaginary* God, nor an *underling*, as these ministers in derision suggest, p. 26. as if because his *Father is greater than he*, he must needs therefore be a very contemptible thing. But this is not the only instance of their contemptuous *flirts* at the blessed *Jesus*, on supposition that he be inferior to the Father ; as I shall observe shortly under what they say of the Holy Spirit.

But I must first take notice of one wonderful remark, p. 31. on those words of Christ, *John 5. 19. Verily I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he sees the Father do; for whatever things he doth, the same doth the Son also in like manner*: Where they put down the Greek word *ὁμοίως*, (which every one, that knows Greek, must say is *likewise*, or *similiter*) and interpret it to be *exactly*, in the same manner as the Father does; and they add, *not one as the proper author, and the other by commission; not one as the principal cause, and the other as a subordinate; not one absolutely, and of himself, and the other as depending on will; for this would make a very wide difference in the manner of their working; whereas we are assured they work exactly alike*. Was ever any thing more extravagantly weak and vain? The word *exactly* is entirely their own addition, and then they argue upon that word, and that directly against the design and letter of the text and context, which is to shew that the Son did nothing of himself, but as the Father shewed, and authorized and commissioned him, as may be seen down to *ver. 31*. And surely there may be a likeness, where yet there is some unlikeness; and indeed 'tis so in near all, if not absolutely in all *families*: Surely a Son may be like his Father, and yet have many differences. How ridiculous would it be, to strain the word *ὁμοίως* so in other places!

His arguments for proving the *Holy Spirit's* supreme Deity are yet weaker, if that may be, p. 32. *He is*, says he, *not only spoken of as the Spirit of God, but he is the Spirit of God, as the soul is the spirit of man*, 1 Cor. 2. 10, 11. And what resemblance can there be, if the Spirit of God be not as essential to the divine Being, as the spirit of man is to the human? Whereas 'tis not said there is any such likeness between the two, that the Holy Spirit

Ver. 20.
27. and
22.

See Vol.
II. p. 346.

Spirit is *so* the Spirit of God, as the soul is the spirit of a man ; only that as the one knows, or makes known the things of a man, so the other the things of God. The *spirit* of a man is so called, in order to distinguish it from his other constituent part, *viz.* the body ; and as 'tis that by which he reveals his mind, so the Spirit of God is that by which he reveals his will to men : There is no further similitude suggested in the text. And he is called also the *spirit of Christ* ; Is he therefore essential to the person of the Son ? Nay, we read of seven, called *the seven Spirits of God*, Rev. 4. 5. and 5. 6. Does this phrase import that they *seven* are essential to the being of God ? No, it only denotes his dominion over them, that they are his ministers, as the one Holy Spirit is his also in a higher sense, and sent by him. But 'tis strange men should think to prove fundamental points from any little *simile*, or obscure metaphor, and difficult text, whose meaning is dark and uncertain to themselves.

The proofs taken from the *attributes* and *operations* of the Spirit, &c. are of no more force here than in the case of the *Son's* supreme deity : both Son and Spirit being agents under God, at his will, are concerned in his glorious works, and partakers of his power and wisdom, &c. So that 'tis no wonder if much of these are attributed to the Spirit, but still as to one *sent of God*, and who *speaks not of his own*, John 16. 13. and first hears before he tells *things to come*. And if this prove him to be God, as is pretended, p. 34. it may prove the Prophets so too.

But indeed these arguments carry less evidence in relation to the *Holy Spirit*, because of the different ideas that the word *Spirit* stands for. I think, by consent of all sides, very often, if not most usually, the *Spirit*, and *Holy Spirit*, signifies not the

the third person, or a *personal* Spirit, but the attributes and operative efficacious virtue of God, the energy of his power, wisdom, and holiness, exerted in powerful operations, *afflatus*, and inspirations; in which respect, it was sometime said *there was yet no Holy Spirit*, before Christ's ascension, *John* 7. 39. and *Acts* 19. 2. So that it is not easy to say when it must mean the Spirit who is the third person. The clearest place for this, is *John* 16. where also there are the greatest marks of his dependence on the *Father and Son*; he shall not *speak of himself*, &c.

Moreover, to the *Spirit* the name of *G O D* is never once given; tho he that lyed to the Holy Ghost, God's agent, did indeed therein lye to God, *Acts* 5. And he who is the *Temple of the Holy Ghost*, is thereby the Temple of God, because he possesses such for, and as coming from, God, *1 Cor.* 6. 19. *The Temple of the Holy Ghost, which ye have from God*; not, which is God. So *Eph.* 2. 21, 22.

Nor is direct worship or invocation, prayer or praise, or glory and dominion, once given to him, in precept or practice, in the New Testament; tho his *communications* are wished and prayed for to Christians, *2 Cor.* 13. ult. And to infer that 'tis however agreeable to the Gospel-doctrine and œconomy, is vain; since the Apostles knew that best, if so indeed, and were concern'd as much as any to put this worship in practice, if necessary: nay we never read of *serving the Spirit*, by men or angels; I may be pardoned, I hope, in slighting the precarious and groundless pretence for this in *Phil.* 3. 3. (against the current Tenor of the gospel) as also, *p.* 38. from such texts (for prayer to the Spirit) as *Rom.* 15. 13. *1 Thess.* 3. 12, 13. *2 Thess.* 3. 5. as if the word *Lord* here must, without any ground, mean the
Holy

Holy Spirit ; for this *Lord* is not named as distinct from the Father and Jesus Christ at all, but is the *same Lord*. Such repetitions of the same person are frequent, *Gen.* 1. 27. and *2 Tim.* 1. 18. *The Lord grant that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day.*

How frivolous is this, to hunt in the dark for forced arguments from such slender fancies as these, in want of fair and direct proofs of so great a point ! Not to say that *those* expressions are rather the Apostle's wishes, than direct prayers. In short, if these men and their brethren will be content to worship the Spirit, no more nor otherwise than he is represented as worshipped in the plain Scripture, there will be no difference between us, nor confusion in our devotions : But when they think to out-do the Apostles themselves in understanding and devotion, in zeal and exactness, I desire to keep pace and company rather with the former. But this by the way.

Add this, that the plain marks of subordination, in the Spirit's being *sent* of God and Christ, &c. are not to be evaded, (as in the case of the *Son*) by any humiliation, or incarnation of the Holy Spirit, as a mediator in a lower nature ; so that he is sent in his divine nature, according to these persons own opinion, nay, is sent too by *Jesus* the mediator, who is granted to be *inferior* to the Father, and yet, as such, he sends the Spirit : And he is *Lord of the Spirit*, *2 Cor.* 3. 18.* And if the Holy Spirit be equal to the * See Dr. Father, then I see not but the Father also, if he *Whitby* on pleased, might be as much under the *Son's* domi- this place. nion as the Spirit is, *John* 16. 7. *I will send the comforter* ; and *chap.* 14. 26. *Whom the Father will send in my name.*

Nor does it affect the cause at all, to call the Spirit *αἰώνιον*, or *everlasting* (if that reading be allow'd)

allow'd) *Heb. 9. 14.* For in the next verse we have also *αἰώνιος eternal inheritance*, yet not inherited from eternity.

But there follows, *p. 36.* such a scurrilous argument, as I believe never dropp'd from a Christian's pen before, for the *Spirit's* being an *absolute*, unaccountable, independent, and *undervived agent*, (that is, the very supreme God, and not a minister of the Father) *viz.* That in this case, (*i. e.* of his being a subordinate minister) since our Lord Jesus, [*that man, that greatest authorized minister that ever was*] when he cast out devils, ascribes it to this blessed Spirit, *Matt. 12. 28.* it will follow, as they insinuate by a scornful question, that *he then lay under the curse of Cham; and a servant of servants was he*, *Gen. 9. 25. i. e.* the vilest and basest of servants, as the expression so doubled imports. For as in commendation of things, 'tis to note the noblest and best of the kind, as *king of kings*, and *song of songs*, so in a way of reproach of evil things, 'tis the worst of all the sort; as *vanity of vanities* is the basest, the meanest sort of vanity. Now supposing the Holy Spirit to be God's glorious, but subordinate minister, why must the acting under him, by our Lord, be therefore scornfully reproached as the basest vassalage and slavery under men?

And since these men own the *man* Jesus Christ is *God's authorized minister*, and we are under his conduct, must we also think that, for this reason, all true Christians are under the curse of *Cham*, and the basest of servants? Is Christ's service therefore so vile and ignoble a servitude, as to make them all held accursed who enter into it, and all because he is under the Father? I appeal to others if this be not a just account of the tendency

dency of their words and arguments, whatever they might think.

I judge if this had been publish'd by some of our loose *Sceptics*, it had been recorded perhaps for one of the prophane speeches of the time ; and I doubt the character of *four eminent London-Ministers* can never hide the shame of it. If it were only that some of their *brethren*, they knew, did believe the *Holy Spirit* to be inferior to *God*, they ought not to have spoken so rudely of the *blessed Jesus* and *Holy Spirit*, under whose subordinate influence they count it not a curse, but a glory and happiness to serve and act, to the honour of *God*. But this it is to write in heat, and with rash prejudice ; else I can't think but they will be truly sorry for it in their cooler temper, that they have ever publish'd what (in the judgment of those whom they oppose) comes as near, for the matter of it, to *blasphemy* and *reproach against the Holy Ghost*, as most words that can easily be thought of, tho it may proceed but from hasty inadvertency and unguarded intemperate zeal. But, *my brethren, these things ought not so to be* ; we should not drop words of contempt on the sacred names of the *blessed Jesus* and *Holy Spirit*, no, not upon our adversaries *hypothesis*, which we judge erroneous ; because no side represents 'em so mean as to be derided for *underlings* or *slaves*.

The conclusion is with an assertion, as false as 'tis confidently delivered, *viz. that the universal Church has agreed in this, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are the one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory ; i. e. with the Assembly's Catechism.*

Understanding this latter part of the proposition, as * *Mr. Evans* does, of the *same numerical* * A Letter to Mr. Cummins, *essence*, it seems to me absurd and inconsistent : because p. 22.

because *identity* will destroy *equality*; the former expressing the essence to be but one, the latter to be more than one; for *simile non est idem*, the like is not the same; and equality is but the highest degree of likeness. If the essence be the very *individual same*, then the essential perfections, *viz.* power, &c. are the same, and not *equal* one to another.

The essence of a thing *is that which it is*. Now, if the essence of the Father, which *is the Father*, be the very essence of the Son, and so *is the Son*, then surely the same which is the Son, is the Father; so that they are made the very same individual thing, tho the names be *two*; and there seems no ground left *to support what is distinctly said of the one and the other in the holy Scriptures*; but 'tis downright *Sabellianism*. If the Scriptures had said they two were the *same* numerically in substance, and yet *equal* in power, the case had been different; but being human invention, I hope I may be more bold to examine it. And I verily believe they cannot produce one testimony for some centuries, of any Christian writer, that ever asserted the glory and dominion of the *Son* and *Spirit* to be equal to that of the *Father*; whatever unity of substance they might suppose, as may be seen in *Tertullian*, they yet, I think, never harbour'd a thought of such equality: and Mr. *Jurieu* himself has shewn this to be true of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers. So that the best part of the universal Church, and in the best and primitive ages, never asserted this; nor the council of *Nice* itself; nor was the *Son's inferiority* to the *Father*, that I find, ever counted by them to be any error, or any peculiar opinion of *Arius*. What then signifies the following agreement of the late degenerate and *half-reformed* churches, who built upon

upon the foundation of *Councils*, and *Athanasius*, instead of the *Sacred Writings* in these matters ?

C H A P. III.

On Mr. Smith's harmony of Confessions.

TO back the evidence from Scripture, (which they have offered, such as it is) Mr. *Smith* presents us with the harmony of the late reformed churches *creeds* or *confessions* in this article of the *blessed Trinity*, p. 39.

I agree with him, that the Bible is very capable of being understood by honest and diligent minds, who use the proper means for it: but as he rightly observes, *if persons bring their pre-conceived notions and ideas of God*, (provided he don't mean those necessary and natural ideas of God, which must be supposed antecedent to the belief of any revelation from him) *and of what is fit, or not fit for him to say, and by those pretend precisely to measure and settle the declarations of his word; no wonder if many times they be found more bold than wise.* And therefore we think it was just thus that the modern churches have erred so much, who appear, and almost indeed profess generally, to have brought with 'em their pre-conceived notions from the councils decisions, and the *Athanasian creed*; (and I may add, that they brought abundance more from the *schoolmens metaphysics*, as their *three properties* and *subsistencies*, &c. shew) and then having settled the sense of texts thereby, they call it Scripture-evidence, and perhaps think it such too, for their old opinions; and yet the *Bible* may be a very good book still to others, let these men say what they please to the contrary, p. 46.

Since the council of *Nice*, or rather after the fourth century, it has (perhaps) been the most commonly received opinion; but for the times *before*, there is no such thing as proofs to be found out of any of those they refer to, that ever the *Son* and *Holy Spirit* were believed by Christians to be two divine persons, *equal in glory and power* to the Father. Let 'em produce any if they can. Bishop *Bull* has a chapter to shew the *subordination* of the Son to the Father; and the Son is so constantly said to have *ministred to the Father* at the creation of the world; that many, both protestant and papist *Trinitarians*, have had the ingenuity to own this of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, as *Jurieu* *, besides *Petavius* and *Huetius*, &c. as shall be shewn in the following *Appendix*.

* Lett.
Past. vol.
3. ch. 6.

As to the previous *observations* to the *harmony*, I only remark, that tho these churches might take their own opinions in this point for true, yet,

1. That not one of these churches, at the *Reformation*, appear to have *deliberately weighed*, or maturely examined these points; but instead of searching how this matter stood in Scripture and primitive antiquity, took it all for granted; and did not proceed *only by the same common rule, the holy Scriptures, before 'em*; as is pretended, p. 44. but had also before 'em another rule, *viz.* the four first convocations or *councils*, and the *Athanasian Creed*. This they oft own, and almost put *these* on a level with the Scriptures in their very words, and much more so in real influence. Thus the first *confession* set down, *viz.* the *Helvetic*, says p. 68. *Whatever hath been defined out of the Holy Scripture, of the mystery of our Lord's incarnation, and is contained in the Creeds of the four first and last councils, viz. Nice, &c. together with that of Athanasius, we sincerely believe, condemning the contrary.* So p. 70. the *French confession*

cession says, we detest all sects condemned out of the word of God, by Athanasius, Hilary, &c. So again, the Saxon confession says, p. 99, 100. We embrace all the writings of the Prophets and Apostles, and in that genuine sense which is expressed in the creeds of the Apostles, of Nice, and of Athanasius; and these creeds we have always steadfastly embraced, and by God's help ever shall—And we constantly condemn all errors repugnant to these creeds. This runs thro' 'em all, more or less; which shews how they were corrupted with violent prejudices.

Were they ever likely to find whether the *Athanasian* creed was true by the Bible, who first understood the Bible in the genuine sense of that creed, and who did not prove that creed by the sacred text, but prov'd the sense of those texts rather by *that*, and other creeds of the 4th and 5th centuries?

Methinks, since the authority of modern Churches is thus abused to mislead weak minds, I am not sorry these gentlemen have let the world see, in what manner they proceeded; they brought their notions with them out of the *Romish* Church, and held 'em still, with their persecuting tenets, upon the same principles as before, and expressly refused conference, as p. 109.

2. That therefore, if the generality of Christians, not in all, but in most ages, have mistaken in these points, under good capacities, and means to understand 'em, 'tis no reflexion on the Bible; nor may they, i. e. the *Antiscripturists* and *Atheists*, say, *What use can such a book be of?* I think, contrarily, that they may not say so, notwithstanding the concurring harmony of these ministers with them; and that because these mistakes appear plainly to arise from want of impartiality, and diligence in the proper means among the *Reformers*.

3. Tho I neither say *they are perished who have gone upon the other (not the old) scheme*; nor grant that any are *brought to the enjoyment of the true God, by the belief of a false one*, as it is p. 47. yet I deny not but that some who, may entertain very gross errors concerning the true God, may yet, thro' his great mercy, and by that piety which by other and better principles may be produced in them, be brought to the enjoyment of him at last. And this is what themselves grant, p. 10. *God is the sovereign disposer of his own grace*. And, p. 12. that such may yet be honest, and *hold fast their integrity*, tho the moral nature and *demerit of such error remains what it was*. Which is an answer to these popular fallacious reasonings of Mr. Smith: so little consistent are they with themselves, when they profess not to judge of the final state of those whom they think to err in these matters; and yet insinuate, at the same time, as if there was no salvation to be had, but only on one side.

And now I come to consider the *harmony of confessions* or creeds themselves, under two heads.

1. That these *confessions* of the Reformed Church are not so harmonious, but that they greatly disagree about the *Trinity*.

2. That they all disagree with the antient *primitive creeds*, and so far are of no value with wise and understanding Christians.

1. These *confessions* of the Reformed Churches are not so harmonious as is pretended, but greatly disagree among themselves in the article of the blessed Trinity. For, (1.) The Council of Nice held them accursed, p. 50. who say the Son is of *another hypostasis*, i. e. from the Father. But the *Belgic Confession*, p. 89. (according to the common doctrine) says, that *the Son and Spirit have each of them an hypostasis distinguished*, &c. The one

one by *hypostasis* mean a *substance*, the other a *subsistence*, or person, or they know not what. Which is no great harmony in speaking.

(2.) The Council of Calcedon says, that *the Son is consubstantial with the Father as to his divinity, and consubstantial with man as to his humanity*. By which explication they plainly shew, that the substance of the Son and Father is not *numerically* one, but one *in kind*; as Christ's humanity was not the same particular substance of other men, but a distinct one of the same sort, p. 58. But others tell us, they have no distinction as to *substance*, p. 107.

(3.) Some hold the Spirit *proceeds only from the Father*, p. 116. others from the Father and Son both, p. 83, 94.

(4.) Some represent the Trinity as *three properties of God*, p. 111. *which are the fountains of other properties*: those (*viz.* the former three) *properties they call three persons*; and these are said to be distinct from the divine *attributes of goodness and wisdom*, and therefore they call them *three other properties*. This is said by the Greek church: Tho, by the way, I wonder how this comes to be one of the *reformed churches*: when did their reformation begin?

But yet others represent the Trinity as three (at least the Son and Spirit as two) of God's *attributes*, which seems to be their sense of *three persons*, *viz.* power, wisdom, and goodness; which the last-mentioned creed gainsays. So the French confession, p. 70. *Three persons*, say they, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; *the Father the cause of all things, the Son his wisdom and word, the Holy Spirit his virtue and power*. So the Belgic, p. 89. Nay, by this, the two persons are made the *properties* and attributes of the Father's person; for 'tis the Father's wisdom is the Son, the Father's

virtue is the *Spirit*: and yet the *Helvetic* Confession, p. 67. expressly condemns of heresy, such as hold the *Son* and *Spirit* to be properties of one God the Father, as Sabellius, &c. And the *Polish* Confession is rather more plain than the *French* and *Belgic*, in making the *Son* an attribute or property of the Father, p. 93. *We call the Father God* — existing from none — who began his only begotten Son, by whom from eternity he foreknew all things, &c. So that the *Son* is here represented to be the Father's understanding, or intellect, by which he knows all things; for I think none will pretend that the Father gains all his knowledge by means of the person of the Son, who had all his own knowledge from the Father.

This may serve for a specimen only, of the discord and confusion of faiths, rather than harmony, among these that are set down; tho' still the Papists have greater harmony in one single creed of Pope Pius, how bad soever it be. I pass to the next head, viz.

2. That all these late and modern Confessions, disagree with the antient and primitive creed, and so are of no real value with considering and serious Christians. Our question is, What was the faith delivered once to the Saints? And I hope the old creed of the primitive churches will tell us that, better than such as have been composed 1500 years afterwards. And since it is acknowledged, that the *Apostles* creed is the confession of the faith of all Christians, and the universal rule of all other confessions, and to have been casual with Christianity, p. 47, 49. we have nothing to do with modern confessions and creed-makers, but to despise them, where they disagree with the original rule of faith, as the creed was styled of old, *regula fidei*. Men have perhaps as much authority to make a new gospel, as a new creed; and

may

may as well draw out *St. Matthew's* or *St. John's Gospel* into a larger history, intermingled with their own observations and interpretations, and then say it is still the same *St. Matthew's* or *St. John's Gospel*, only explained; as to draw out their creeds into great lengths, and intermix their own interpretations, and then say, it is but the same *creed* with the *Apostles*.

They have, p. 59. given this ancient *creed* out of both *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, but it is after *those* of the general *councils*; as if *their* testimony to the ancient *creed* was not a hundred times of more regard than the *creeds* new-made by after *councils*: for they pretended not to frame a *creed* themselves, like the spurious *Athanasian* author; nor to explain it in their own sense, as the *councils* did, but to relate it short and simple, tho not in quite the same words.

What the particular notions of these two authors might be, is not so much to us, as what their *creed* expresses, which we also are judges of: *their* interpretations of it will be no more binding than of *texts* of Scripture, of which we may judge, whether reasonable or not, from the text itself*.

C. c. 3

Irenæus

* How widely these two, *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, differed from the common notion of the Son's equality to the Father, may be seen in *Dr. Whitby's Disquis. modest. in Bullii Defens. Fid. Nic.* The former distinguishes the Father commonly by this character, *Deus super quem non est alius Deus*; and owns him to be greater than the Son, in that he only knew the day of judgment. *l. 2. c. 49.* The latter says, that once the Son was not; *adv. Hermog. c. 3. Fuit tempus cum Filius non fuit.* There was a time when the Son was not; and counts him but a portion of the Father's substance, as a beam is of the sun; and says, that tho he might call the Son *God*, speaking of him alone; yet speaking of him with the Father, he would not name him so at the same time with him, but would call only the Father *God*, and the Son *Lord*. *Cont. Prax. c. 13.* Nor do their own citations from them imply the equality of the Son to the Father, in power and glory. T. E.

Ireneus says, this *immovable rule of faith*, is *one and the same* in all countries thro' the earth. Therefore, if the many modern *confessions* differ from this old creed, the rule of faith, what signifies it tho they were ten times more? See if the *three persons* are there called the *one God*; tho the Father alone is so: *In one God the Father*, was the antient form of the first article, as that learned author *Sir Peter King* whom they cite, tells us, *Hist. of Cr. p. 55.* Is the *Son's equality to the Father* there mentioned? Or the *Holy Spirit's*? Is there any thing of *subsistencies, properties, or modes* there? Or of many more things which the present *harmony* is full of? If not, then this confutes them all. But yet if the *old creed* will suffice, and makes any part in the *harmony*, then those also called *Arians* come into it; if not, why is it produced, unless to shew how much the modern churches differ from the primitive? Which is to reproach them, and will hardly invite any considering Christians to bear any part in such harmony, as is so discordant with the *faith delivered at first to the Saints.*

We need not regard what strange inferences *St. Austin*, or other such late writers, in the times of confusion and corruption, drew from the *Apostles* creed to support their opinions; but only whether they were natural and obvious, or forced and strange: nor how much any may count their modern notions of the Trinity their *glory*; but on what grounds they glory in them, in common with the church of *Rome*; many of whom confess this doctrine is not to be proved from Scripture, but from the authority of their church; as is transubstantiation also.

CHAP. IV.

On Mr. Reynolds's *Advices*.

AND now we come, in the last place, to the Adviser, Mr. Reynolds. I will not deny, but he suggests many serious things, fit for all to consider; viz. To walk so as to please God in our whole course, to pray earnestly, to read the word of God; and to carry an humble and meek disposition along with us in our inquiries. All this is very good; but it no more concerns those on *one* side of the questions in dispute, than those on the *other*; and is no more proper in the present case, than in all cases about the change of principles, or going off from one scheme of religion to another, or in any sort of religious separation.

And yet even such advices, good in the general, may be designed, and practis'd too, in a very ill manner, viz. If a man read only in favour of one side, as one determin'd not to consider any arguments against his already chosen opinion, and worldly interest; and so it is if he only prays to be confirmed in what he is pleased with, be it right or wrong, instead of praying to be guided into what is the truth. This is coming to God with an *idol in his heart*; and he will be nothing better for reading and praying, when his will is determin'd what he will in particular hold to, whatever evidence shall appear.

And so, tho' humility be an excellent disposition, yet there is a naughty and false sort of *humility* too, which some seem to aim at in these matters, viz. For a man to lay his understanding and reason under his *Minister's* (or others) *feet*, while *theirs* is to be set upon the lofty *throne*, delivering

their imperious dictates and explications of texts, with expectation they shall be blindly received by others, tho they see no just reason for it. But this is only having a *show of humility*: for it is no true *Christian* humbleness of mind to call any man on earth (minister, or other) *Master*; Mat. 23. 10.

No, it is no more such, than to lie groveling at the foot of a wooden idol or stock is for it is a sinful debasing of human nature, to let any man ride and rule us thus, without encouraging us to use our reason in diligent and impartial searches of our own: it is not lowliness, but baseness of mind, to *admire any man's person* so as to believe with *his faith* only, and not to prove all things ourselves, and to accept helps on both sides; a thing which our adviser, it seems, durst not recommend.

A truly humble mind will not indeed, as is said, p. 130. *affect to pry into secret things*: no more will it like this in others, who take upon them to explain God by *substance*, *substances*, and *persons*, &c. when they know not what they say; but will honour them who are content with what God himself has *expressed of himself*. And above all, an humble mind will not censure, and reproach, and divide from those, who are as desirous, as diligent, as capable, and as much or more disinterested than himself, to find the truth, only because they judge not his explications or consequences to be just and right: *He that rageth, and is thus confident*, is of another Spirit.

I pass by the odious and unjust insinuations, p. 137. as if those they speak of *concluded nothing to be true, but what they can understand*; and that they will not believe what God says of himself, unless he *show them how it can be*: things which they disown, and abhor to think or say. And I see

not

not how any, but from base envy, or gross ignorance, can impute such folly to them.

Now that our *Adviser* has not dealt sincerely, but with manifest *partiality*, in his grave advice and motives, (where there is any thing properly applicable to the matters of the present debate) I think, will appear from two things.

First, In reading the Scriptures, and other writings, (which is the most direct means of coming at truth) he plainly insinuates, men should read but on one side; viz. for his and their old accustomed opinions, p. 128. he says, *We may also use the help of the discourses and writings of those, who have made it their study to show what Scripture-evidence there is on the side of the commonly received faith, and to discover the fallacies of those, who have endeavour'd to embarrass and pervert it.* But he never gives one word of advice to read the writings on the other side, and to compare 'em together, and to see where the superior evidence lies. This had been but just and honest in any doubtful case, where it is intended men should judge without partiality; whereas to have but one ear open, and to stop all the avenues of light, but just where we have a mind to see, is the ready way to remain in delusion; and is just as if a judge or jury should only hear the pleadings of one side.

And I am credibly informed, this very gentleman has lately warned his people, in a solemn manner, not to read the books of such as write against the commonly received opinions in this controversy, because of the great danger of their being tainted by them. And is this an honest way of examination? 'Tis plain he would have 'em determine without examination, and take all upon trust; but if himself has only studied and searched in this way, it is no great recommendation.

mendation of him to be *trusted* by his people in this important affair. And one would think they should smell out the deceit, if they be not very dull; but if *his people love to have it so*, I shall only say, what will be the end thereof? How will they answer it to their judge, (if they be in the wrong especially) who commanded 'em to *try the spirits*, and to *prove all things*? That when *light came into the world*, they loved darkness rather, is matter of grievous condemnation to some. Rather let every serious understanding Christian stand and ask after the good old ways; let him conscientiously read, hear, and confer, think and weigh on each side; and thus doing, labour to be *fully persuaded in his own mind*; and then he may have rejoicing in his own sincerity before the God of truth.

I am afraid there is a great deal of this unrighteous partiality and bigotry among the dissenting bearers also, in not so much desiring to know or to have their pastors build 'em up in the truth and faith of the Gospel as it really is, as to be built up and defended in their particular set of accustomed opinions. The gentlemen of *Exon* have been so very frank and open-hearted as to discover this to the world, and could not, it seems, forbear telling their ministers (by their own account) that they were *paid for preaching down* such particular opinions. But what would men think of such language as this to their ministers? 'Reverend Sirs, we chuse you to maintain these opinions for us to be gospel: if you will not only search for 'em, but will find 'em in the Bible, or, at least, if you'll tell us so in the pulpit, and in conversation, you shall have so much *per annum* for your pains; but if you say or doubt you can't find 'em there, and put us upon the difficulty to shew where they are

in

in the Scripture, we shall pay you no more. Tell us what other things you will out of the Gospel, in order to promote holiness, peace, justice, heavenly-mindedness, and obedience to the laws of God and Christ; yet if you can't bring the *New Testament* to square herein with our *Catechism* and old notions, you are not to expect your salary any longer; nor do we desire to hear your reasons against what we think, and will have, to be truth, if we can get it maintained for our money. I leave it to others to judge if this be any unjust, tho' a blunt, interpretation of those words; *This* (viz. to preach down those errors) *is what you are paid for*; and whether such mutual advice; given be-

*See their Answer to Mr. Pierce's Case, &c. p. 14.

tween pastors and people, to study only on one side, has any tendency to, or shews any sincere desire of, finding the truth as 'tis in and from Jesus; nay, whether on these terms dissenting teachers will not be the most servile, of men, and not far from the curse of *Cham* indeed. Secondly, His motives of persuasion are some of 'em deceitful: some of them are too general, relating to any *dissensions*, or differences, and such as these very men are deaf to, in the case of separation from the established church for less matters. Then, how little did it sadden their hearts, or move 'em, that it saddened the hearts of other good people, to observe the comely band of union broken? p. 144. The strife this might occasion was not then so lamentable; such infelicities did not shake 'em at all. And do they think to deceive others with such arguments as they have taught 'em to despise? I grant *Unity* and *Peace* are amiable; but if men will not maintain any but on sinful terms, it may be bewailed, but cannot be helped on one side. I know not what they can say to these things: If *when young, their*
unexperienced

unexperienced heads had little thought of these things, do they, now they are become grave and wise persons, think of 'em with sorrow of heart? If not, how can they expect it, or require it of those who dissent from them for greater reasons?

Not only this, I say, but some of their motives are too base and carnal, viz. p. 146. such as leaving old acquaintances and hearty friends, and grieving to see dear relatives weeping for 'em. Now, to use these flattering carnal persuasions against complying with the dictates of conscience, and the convictions of our minds, (which is the case supposed) is unworthy of the ministers of Christ: they are to teach men otherwise, even to hate or abandon father and mother, house and lands, &c. and to account all but loss and dung in a faithful adherence to the truths and laws of Christ. Luke 14. 26. As well they might tell their brethren, they'll lose all their salary too, if they preach not up what they were paid for, (as the *Exon* phrase is,) and then what will they and their ruined families do? But is not this way of arguing childish and fawning, rather than convincing and solid?

Towards the conclusion, p. 147. there is something design'd to look like charity, which yet implies the contrary: speaking of their brethren, Here at least, they say, they have not yet fully and peremptorily declared themselves, but seem rather to be in doubt only about these matters: and then add a little after, — That we have no such aversion or prejudice to their persons that can hinder us, upon their sincere acknowledging of the truth, from receiving them again with the most friendly embraces. Which plainly declares that now, at present, they do reject 'em, and have already cast 'em off; and this,

this, tho they appear only to be in some doubt about these matters, and have not yet fully and openly declared themselves.

It seems then, these severe gentlemen will not bear so much as any doubts or scruples in their brethren about these matters: if they stick at any difficulty, and have any scruples of conscience on the point, this must dissolve the union of friendship, and the communion of worship; and there is no coming into their friendly embraces again, till upon their hearty acknowledgments, they are received again. And is this an encouragement to their people to advise with 'em, or to apply to their ministers, if they should ever have any doubts in the case, when for but doubting they must be cast off? surely, it will justify 'em in applying rather to others. Men may cover this schismatical dividing spirit with what smooth professions they please, of all the moderation and temper that is consistent with faithfulness, and throw all the blame on others; but I am deceived, if in acting thus against righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, they will be acceptable to God, or approved of men: and I can't think their devotion in concluding with an unscriptural form of doxology, will atone for what they have said and done against charity, tho but unawares.

And as I like very well the passage they alledge from the great Chillingworth, p. 128. that no demonstration can be stronger than this, God hath said so, and therefore it must be true: so I hope, they also will like and consider another passage which I'll offer from him, viz. 'By the religion of Protestants, I do not understand the doctrine of Luther or Calvin—nor the confession of Geneva, the articles of the Church

of England, no, nor the *harmony* of protestant
confessions; but that wherein they all agree with
 a greater harmony, as the perfect rule of faith,
 that is the *Bible*. And I judge, he would
 have abated nothing of all this, if the *Assembly's*
confession had been in the *harmony* also.
 But it seems, tho that was attempted, it would
 not be admitted to this honour by the magi-
 strates nor church of Geneva, when the *harmony*
of confessions was reprinted there, Anno 1654.
 This I learn from a very late author*, tho I
 know not the reasons of that refusal; and I
 hope it shall never, even among the dissenters
 here, be able to supplant the *Bible*, or be esteemed
 a better antidote against *heresy* and *error*, than
 the unerring *oracles of God*: rather, let God (and
 his Word) be true, and every man (with his con-
 sequences and explications) a *liar*.

Rom. 3.

4.

* See the famous trial of the reverend Mr. James Grame,
 once professor, &c. at St. Andrews, p. 70. and Preface, p. 12.



An



An APPENDIX concerning the
Equality of the Three Persons;
with Mr. Jurieu's Testimony to the
Primitive Doctrine in this Point.

HAVING before denied the assertion of these gentlemen, p. 39. viz. That *the universal Church has agreed in this, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are the One God, equal in power and glory*, I shall pursue this main point a little further, and shew from Mr. Jurieu's own confession, and upon his full examination of this matter, that there appears not any sign, among the primitive Christian writers, of such a doctrine being taught in the Christian Church, as that of the Son's being *equal in power and glory* to the Father, for the first three or four hundred years.

If I should produce the testimonies of any of the *Romish* communion, such as *Petavius* and *Huetius*, &c. some would suspect 'em as treacherous in the cause: if I produce *Sandius*, or others, accounted *Arians*, it will be said they are partial in favour of their own opinions. But Mr. *Jurieu*, as he was a man of great learning and abilities, so he is well known to have been a man of great *orthodoxy*, according to the common standard, a true *Calvinist*, and a very vehement and severe writer against the *Socinians* and *Arians*; and therefore I suppose they will reverence

rence him and his testimony, and can't suspect him to be partial against his own cause, or in behalf of his adversaries. This testimony shall be taken from his *Pastoral Letters*, written for the comfort and establishment of the French protestants under persecution, about forty years

* Vol. 3. ago.
in French,
12°. Lett.
6.

In his *sixth letter* he makes some animadversions on a book of the Bishop of Meaux, who charged the protestants with variations from the primitive doctrine in the point of justification, &c. and consequently with error, upon this principle, which he laid down, viz. *That the truth, coming from God, is complete and perfect in its first delivery*; so that all variation from that is a swerving from the right rule. Mr. Jurieu condemns this principle as taken at large, and says,

P. 126, 7.

That if Mr. Bossuet means that *the truth was at first best understood, and most happily explained*, 'tis so far from being a true position, that the direct contrary to it is true: that divine truths were not revealed but by degrees, nor revelation itself fully understood and explain'd till after many ages, when, by means of the united aid of an infinite number of Doctors, more light was given; and that it was occasion'd by heresies and hereties, that the knowledge of Christian truths came to the perfection, in which they have been for 1200 or 1300 years past. And he alledges, That the most essential articles of the Christian religion not only suffered some variations in the outward forms of expression, until the fourth and fifth centuries, but also that the change of expression was such as might give men quite different ideas of things. And adds, That he was tempted to think, Surely Mr. Bossuet never look'd into the writings of the Fathers of the four first ages, if he knew not this.

P. 125.

and therefore I suppose they will have. Then

Then he proceeds to prove this from an eminent instance, *viz.* That of the *adorable Trinity of persons in the same essence*; which he thinks is contained clearly in the *New Testament*, and was discerned by the *first Christian Doctors*, and which he judges to be an article of *utmost importance, and essential to Christianity*; but yet, says he, *Every one knows, that this mystery remain'd without its right form or * shape, until the Council of Nice, * Informa-* nay, until that of Constantinople itself. And this he represents in *two great points, viz.* the *temporal* (tho antemundane) *generation of the second person of the Trinity*, and his *inequality to the Father*; *both* which he not only says, but by proper citations fully proves, to have been unanimously professed by *all the antients of the three first ages*; who held indeed (some of 'em) *three distinct persons of one substance*, but (as he says) *begotten and proceeding in time*; and also making an inequality between the Father and the Son. And yet, I suppose, none of them ever said the *Four Lon-* Son was an *underling*, or his servants the *basest of don-Mini-* slaves. *sters, p. 36.*

He shews the former of these, from *Albenagoras, Tatian, Theophilus, and Tertulian*, who believed the Son to have been *eternally hid within the Father virtually and seminally*, but that he was *generated of the Father*, and became a *distinct person from him but a little while before the creation*. So that by their account, Mr. Jurieu ob- P. 128.— serves, the *Trinity of persons commenced but a lit-* 132. *tle before the world began.*

However, Mr. Jurieu comforts himself with this, That 'tis not a *fundamental difference, because 'tis neither Socinianism nor Arianism*, (nor is that so which I plead for) and he lays much of the blame of it upon that *ill-translated text*, Prov. 8. 22. *Thou hast created me the beginning of thy*
VOL. II. D d ways;

ways; for so the Greek and old Latin versions read it. But whether right or not, it matters not here, since it appears the ancients unanimously embraced that reading, and sense of the text, as no way inconsistent with the analogy of their faith concerning Christ, the *Word*; whom tho they did not use often to call a *creature* by the common word *κρίστος*, yet they never scrupled to say *he was created*, and the *beginning* of God's ways, or of the *creation of God*.

Rev. 3.
14.

Tertullian (arguing against *Hermogenes*, who held the eternity of *matter*) speaks very broad: *Let Hermogenes, says he, acknowledge, that the wisdom of God* (which he also calls the *Word*, and only-begotten Son of God) *is therefore said to be created, that we might not think any thing to be uncreated but God alone; for if what was within the Lord, and was in, and of himself, viz. his wisdom, was not without a beginning, much more had every thing else a beginning which is out of God.--- Shall any thing be more antient than the Word, the only-begotten Son of God, except the Father*?*

And it appears, when such words as *ἐξ ουδενος*, and *pariari*, &c. were used, it was without any design of signifying equality in *power and glory*; and only meant some *likeness*, or at most equality in the philosophical nature of their *substance*.

This latter point, *viz.* the denying of the Son's equality to the Father, he represents from the same *Athenagoras* and *Tertullian*; and that not as their own particular imaginations, but as the common

* Agnoscat ergo *Hermogenes*, idcirco *Sophiam Dei* natam & conditam prædicari, nè quid innatum & inconditum præter solum Deum crederemus. Si enim intra Dominum quod ex ipso, & in ipso fuit, sine initio non fuit; *Sophia* scilicet ipsius; — multo magis non capit sine initio quicquam fuisse, quod extra Dominum fuerit, &c. *Tertul. cont. Hermog.* c. 18, &c.

mon theology of the learned of *their age*, both in the *East and West*; also from *Justin Martyr*, who oft calls the Son the *Father's servant*, and says, he was *subject to his will, before the incarnation*; and from *Ireneus*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and says, that *after all*, *Origen*, whom they afterwards censured so very rigorously, has not spoken more harsh things on this subject, than the other writers of his age, p. 133. (Mr. Du Pin says the like of *Origen*,) tho he confesses again, that these *Eccl. Hist.* expressions of the primitive writers give us *very* vol. 1. *false ideas, and most different from ours* in these latter days, which he thinks to be best and most exact.

And tho some may be ready to look on Mr. *Jurieu*, by his strange way of arguing, to be scarcely in earnest, yet he is so very serious in it, that he devoutly admires the wisdom of the divine providence in this method, *viz.* ' That at the ' very time, when *Antichristianism* was ready to ' enter into the church, and to make such ha- ' vock and desolation in religion, as hath been, ' and is yet seen, there was so great care taken ' of these *fundamental* articles; and that in or- ' der to preserve the foundations of Christianity ' from being destroyed by *Antichrist*, they were ' put under the protection of such an authority, ' (*viz.* that of general councils) as *Antichristi-* ' *anism* itself could not but, in some measure, ' reverence. And, says he, the same providence ' so order'd it, that these fundamentals, which ' had been hitherto but very imperfectly explain'd, ' were then explained with the utmost *accuracy* ' and justice.' p. 127.

But possibly some others will think, that *Anti-* ' *christ* was even then *already come*, and that then ' began his predicted kingdom of *apostacy*: that ' then, by those councils, was the foundation laid

of the two great instances of *Antichristian idolatry*, viz. the extravagant worship of the blessed *Virgin*, under the swelling title of the *Mother of God*; and the *worship of bread*, under that of the *body of the supreme God*; and that the prince of darkness, the enemy of truth and love, could not have taken a more effectual course to promote error and cruelty, than by prompting men to assume *dominion over the faith* of their brethren, and under pretence of better stating and explaining the *old* creed, to alter and pervert it; and then, by pretended authority, by cruel *anathemas*, and persecutions, (which now began among Christians) to impose their own notions on others as a *test* of Christianity, and Christian communion; and all this made sacred too, by a claim of great reverence due to the decisions of an *infinite number of Doctors*, who too often, alas, were so full of the *wrath of man*, of strife and party-contention, that in vain went they about *working the righteousness of God*.

The event has shewn what success these methods have had with succeeding generations; and that the churches never after this enjoyed true peace, except it was in times of stupid ignorance and midnight darkness, under Antichristian tyranny, which at the return of new light appeared intolerable, and *Israel* groaned to come out of *Egypt*, by a *reformation*; and well had it been if the first *reformers* (who yet were, many of them, good and excellent men) had not stopped so much at the *four general Councils*, but had gone backward up to the *four Evangelists*, and the Apostles themselves, in their inquiries after the primitive Christian doctrine, especially in fundamentals: but it appears from the *harmony* of their *confessions*, how much they relied on the authority of those councils with an implicit faith;

faith; whereas those councils, by Mr. *Jurieu's* account, give us such expressions, and such ideas too of these things, as were not taught in the more primitive times and churches: so that (according to the 21st article of the church of England) we may adventure to say, *general councils may err, and have erred, in things pertaining to God.*

But tho Mr. *Jurieu* still maintain'd the modern opinions, under all this conviction of their being quite different from the primitive, upon the strength of this vain conceit, viz. That the Christian faith was brought to greater perfection in after-ages; yet as I am sure the true primitive Christians, who had the Apostles for their teachers, or those who conversed with the Apostles, did, not fatally err, but *obtained a precious and saving faith*, 2 Pet. 1. 1. so all such, who with me esteem the faith as at first *delivered to*, and received by *the Saints*, beyond those later notions which varied from it, are content, I presume, to sit down with the old plain apostolic doctrine, before it was mended (if it must be so) by the Council of *Nice* or *Constantinople*: and we may hope, that those, who have attained to a greater than the *primitive* perfection of *faith*, will, at least, not pronounce *ours* damnable, nor think us utterly unworthy of their communion, (tho it should be in the lowest form) for its being of the *Ante-Nicene* stamp. And yet, a *subscribing* brother has very rashly declared, that *without giving equal divine honour to Father, Son, and Spirit, all our religious exercises are unacceptable to God.*

Mr. Ridgley's Unreasonableness of the Charge of Imposition, &c. p. 23.

Now I think this is dealing out his uncharitable and cruel *anathema's* as freely as ever the *Councils* have done. What is this less than pronouncing us damned, and unfit for church-communion, for not consenting to *his* interpretations? And

since he owns, that a creed, with the addition of such a *sanction*, comes within the verge of *imposition*, p. 12. and vindicates his brethren and himself from the *imputation of imposition on others*, p. 35. only upon this supposition (which he untruly pretends to be fact,) viz. *That they content themselves without any coercive methods to bring him, that disagrees in sentiments, to be of their mind; and that, tho they judge him heterodox according to their way of thinking, they do yet pretend only to judge for themselves; I do conclude he has confirmed the charge of imposition: for he has peremptorily judged for his brethren, that they are unacceptable to God, and unfit for church-society; which I think is coercion and anathema and a mark of distinction with a witness, on such as disagree to his sentiments.*

And I think I may venture to say further, That even the Council of *Nice* never asserted the *equality of the three persons*; no, nor of the *Son* to the *Father*: for as to the *Holy Spirit*, tho he had been spoken of as inferior to, and as made by, the *Son*, in the earlier writers; and it was also apparent, that the *Arians* had not so high an opinion of *him*, as they had of the *Son*: yet that council never so much as contested with them the point of the *Holy Spirit's* equal dignity, nor enter'd any caution about it; nor do they so much as call him *God of God*, or *God* in any sense; or declare him to be *one substance* with the *Father*, but barely say, *I believe in the Holy Spirit*. And therefore Mr. *Jurieu* said, the Christian faith was not *completely* understood and expressed till the Council of *Constantinople*, (which was about fifty years after, and even that Council only styled him *Lord*, and ascribes *worship* to him) so that there is no pretence for the churches agreement, at that

time, in the assertion of the *Assembly's Catechism*, viz. That all the *three persons are equal in power and glory*.

Nor do I think the *Nicene Fathers* give any marks of their believing the *Son's equality to the Father in power and glory*, but the contrary. For,

(1.) They declare the *Father to be the one God Almighty*, *παντοκράτωρ*, or Ruler of all: *I believe in one God the Father*. Then,

(2.) They call the *Son only God of God*, i. e. a God derived of that One God the Father; which has been generally allowed, by the reputed orthodox, to import an abatement of the *Son's glory*, and to give a *pre-eminence of glory* to the Father; and on this account they have granted, that the *Father is greater* than he, and the *Son inferior* to him. How many of the first reformers could I produce for this? But it is not needful, nor will it, I think, be denied. *It is not evil for any one to say* (says *Zanchius*) *That he, who is God of God, is inferior to him who is not God of God, but has his Deity of himself**.

(3.) The other expression of the *Nicene creed*, *Light of Light*, seems to imply the *inequality* also. The earlier writers had often resembled the *Father* and *Son*, to the sun and the sun's beams or rays, as *Tertullian* in the place formerly cited: the *Father* was represented as the whole vast *body* of the sun, and the *Son* as a small part or portion, a ray or a beam; the *Father is the whole substance*, the *Son a derivation and portion of that whole*.

D d 4

To

* Neque impium fuerit, si quis dicat, Deum, qui est de Deo, inferiorem esse illo, qui Deus non est de Deo; majus enim quiddam est deitatem habere à semetipso, quam ab alio sibi communicatam. *Zanch. Epist. ad Johan. Wilhelm. Stuck. as I find him quoted by Sandius. And Tertul. says the same, cont. Herm. c. 18. T. E.*

To some such notions the *Nicene Fathers* may seem to allude ; or else perhaps to his being called the ἀπαύγασμα, the *brightness of the Father's glory*, Heb. 1. 3. Which brightness may be applied to a very small matter, in comparison of the glorious sun itself ; as *Nazianzen*, tho on another occasion, has the expression, viz. *The little brightness of the huge glorious luminary* *.

(4.) The word *homoousios*, or of *one substance with the Father*, which is added, does not at all imply any *equality of power and glory*, whatever it does as to sameness of nature and kind of the substance : for huge body of the sun is of much more power and glory than a single ray ; and we have already seen from *Tertullian*, that those, who held the *Father and Son* to be one in *substance*, did yet hold the *Son* to be inferior : and since it could not but be well known, that the *one substance* would never establish the *Son's equality* to the *Father*, there is no doubt to be made but the *council* would have added other words, that should have done it, if they had been of that mind, or if they had really blamed *Arius* for asserting the *Son's inferiority* : no, they would not go so far, tho they boldly ventured at the *one substance*. Some indeed had gone before them in that point, but none that I know of had afforded them a precedent for asserting an *equality* of glory and dominion, nor did they venture to give *one* to others.

Hence it appears, that it was no branch of *Arianism*, nor any proper opinion of *Arius*, viz. To hold the *Father's superiority* to our Lord *Jesus Christ*, his *Son*, as *God of God* ; nor was this objected against *Arius*. And tho there seemed to be disposition enough to find fault, and to add such words

* *Nazian. Orat. 34.*—Μεγάλη Φῶς μικρὸν ἀπαύγασμα.

words to their creed too, as might be most disagreeable, where they had any fair colour for it, (as appears in their choice of the word *homousios*, when they understood it would disgust the *Arians*, as St. *Ambrose* informs us *) yet it seems they presumed not to say one word of the *equality of glory*, which must have more effectually done their work against the *Arians*, than the word *consubstantial* itself †.

And if this be a just account of things, either as to the *Nicene* Fathers themselves, or especially as to the more primitive Christian writers; then I demand of these *four* Gentlemen, how they came to deliver such a manifest error in fact, with so much assurance? It might be judged not civil to impute to them utter unacquaintance with these matters; and yet perhaps it would not be very kind to deprive them of that plea, unless I knew of a better, which I do not: for it would seem to me very strange, to hear a man of moderate honesty, confidently publish it to the world, That *the universal church has agreed in this, That Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are the one God; the same in essence, equal in power and glory*; unless he could very sincerely profess, that he had never examined into the fact, but took it for granted to have been so.

Let it be remember'd, that I am not now enquiring about the *oneness* or *equality of substance* in the *three persons*; nor whether those few ancient

* *Lib. 3. de Fide.*

— Hoc verbum in tractatu Fidei posuerunt Patres, quod viderunt adversariis esse formidini.

† So little signifies all that *Bishop Bull, Dr. Waterland, &c.* lay their main stress upon, viz. the *consubstantiality*; wholly omitted by the earliest Christian writers; rashly asserted by *Tertullian*, yet flatly rejected by others; and after all is nothing to the main point; and is what no man on earth knows any thing of. T. E.

tient Christian writers who speak of it, had any real grounds for such a notion; nor whether, upon that notion, they might not also have proceeded to maintain the *equality* of all the three, in *power, knowledge, glory, and dignity, &c.* But I am only upon matter of *fact*; and I think it is plain in fact, that they never did maintain that *equality* of the *three*, but directly asserted the contrary. And I will add, that this one point, *viz.* of the equal and unequal glory and power of the *three* persons, is in a manner the *sum total* of the controversy now on foot among us, as far as religion and religious worship is concerned in it: the rest, *viz.* about *substance* and *eternity*, is only matter of philosophic speculation.

For serious religion is not a business of metaphysics, or a set of fine notions, about the nature of *God's substance*, or his *spirituality* and absolute *eternity*, and the like; which, if our own reason does not naturally lead us to have some speculations of, revelation seems not much to concern it self, or us, with them. Nor are these the grounds of our worship or obedience: One that has, in a manner, no notion of these points (and indeed who has any that are direct and clear?) may love, worship, and obey God very sincerely, from a deep sense of his sovereign authority over him. And if there were any being, tho of never so spiritual a substance or eternal existence, which yet was without any relation to us, or dominion over us, we should not call it therefore *our God*, nor think we ought to worship, honour, and obey it, only for its being an eternal substance, &c.

So that the whole matter of religion and religious worship is to be govern'd by a right sense of the glorious power and dominion of *Him with whom we have to do*: They who have *equal* power and authority, *equally* absolute, and unlimitable,
and

and unaccountable, may expect *equal* acknowledgments, the *same* esteem and honour: but it will be otherwise, if their dignity be *unequal*. And therefore, if among the *Sacred Three* (for they care not to tell us *what three* to call them) we find *ONE*, *from and by whom* the other two are furnished with all the excellencies and abilities they have, and *under and for whom* they act, and *to whom* they are accountable: This *One*, this *First Cause* and *Ultimate End*, will doubtless appear greatly *superior* to the others in *power and glory*: so that it will seem injurious to level *his* honour and glory to theirs, or to advance *theirs* to the same pitch with *his*.

And I dare say, as much as these men talk (from their catechism) of an *equality* of the *three*, yet, if it were but in general determined, that there is *one* of them greatly *superior* to the other *two*, in power, knowledge, and glorious dignity, there is not any of them would be at the least loss to distinguish which is that *SUPREME HE*.

Rom. 15. 5, 6. *The God of patience and consolation grant us to be likeminded toward one another, according to Christ Jesus, that with one mind, and one mouth we may (as, I think, all agree they can) glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.*



The T A B L E.

M R. Tong's hard insinuations against his brethren.	Page 370
The first Reformers made great use of external force in matters of religion.	372
The way made use of at Dublin lately.	374
The subscribing brethren themselves not open and free to tell their sentiments about the Trinity.	377
Their unjust reproach on others retorted on themselves.	380
Who are Sabellians, and what their error.	384
They have no determinate sense of the Trinity, nor of the divine unity.	385
Their evidence for the Son's Deity from the Old Testament considered.	388
Their evidence from the New Testament considered	390
Their proofs of the Deity of the Holy Spirit.	392
'Tis not always certain when the personal Spirit is meant by the word Spirit.	394
Invocation of the Spirit, if not found in the Scripture, why not to be inferred merely from consequences.	ib.
The subordination of the Spirit not to be evaded, as in the case of the Son.	395
A very irreverent argument brought against the Spirit's subordination.	396
Why the modern churches might unawares err in their confessions, depending too much on councils.	399
Those confessions disagree among themselves.	402
— And with the primitive true creed.	404
Mr. Reynolds's advice consider'd.	407
His advice to read, &c. partial.	409
His motives too general, and too mean.	411, 412
Great uncharitableness towards their brethren who doubt.	413
The Assembly's confession not admitted in the Harmony, &c. at Geneva.	414
Mr. Jurieu's testimony to the primitive doctrine of the Trinity before the council of Nice.	415
That the antient Christian writers held the generation of the Son to be a little before the creation of the world.	417
That they held not the Son to be equal to the Father.	418
The council of Nice assert not the equality of the three persons.	422
No branch of Arianism to deny the equality of glory and dominion, which is the great point in debate.	424, 426

The Reverend
Mr. *TROSSE*'s Arguments
A N S W E R E D;

Relating to the
Lord Jesus Christ,
And the DEITY of the
Holy Ghost.

Taken from
His CATECHISM, and SERMON on
Luke xxii. 31. printed at *Exon.*

Does God know himself best? or do we know him yet better?
Shall he never tell us, there are *three* that equally possess *all*
divine perfections, and are but *one God*, and we tell him,
that this must be? Is not this insupportable arrogance?
— *The words of Dr. Calamy of Inspiration, p. 212. in-*
verted and rectified nearer to truth.

I have sometimes thought (when I have read the Four Evan-
gelists) that Christ was apprehensive, men, in their *pretended*
love to him, would quite forget his Father, and *terminate*
their honour and affections in the Son; which he appears
solicitous to prevent, and more expressly *John* ch. xiv, xv,
xvi, xvii, and elsewhere. — *Mr. M. Sylvester's Preface*
to his Sermons, Part I.

The Reverend

Mr. TROSBEE's Arguments

ANSWERED

Relating to the

Lord Jesus Christ

And the DEITY of the

Holy Ghost

By

His Obedient and Servant

Alexander Aikin

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
YALE UNIVERSITY
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT 06510
U.S.A.
1773



THE P R E F A C E.

HAVING taken the liberty of inverting and altering Dr. Calamy's words, with which the title-page of Mr. Trosse's arguments is garnished, I think it but fair to restore them as they are cited from his own book; viz. Does God know himself best? or, do we know him yet better? Shall he tell us, there are three that equally possess all divine perfections, and yet but one God; and shall we tell him, this cannot be? Is not this insupportable arrogance? *Which words, as here recited, do very plainly insinuate these things: First, That God has told us, there are three that equally possess all divine perfections. And Secondly, That yet these three are one God. I demand of the Doctor, where God tells us any such things? Thirdly, That the Unitarians (in relation to whom he is speaking) are ready to tell God, That tho they find he has said it, yet it cannot be: else he should have placed it to their ignorance, and not to their arrogance, or to their presuming they know God better than he knows himself.*

Which are insinuations of things so grossly false and uncharitable, that I will suppose him more ashamed to vindicate his words in this sense, than to retract them; unless there be some covert meaning in them. For, perhaps, the Doctor means it only on supposition, that God had told us such things, with-
out

out believing that he has indeed said them; and that then it had been arrogance to tell him, this cannot be, which is nothing to the Unitarians more than to Mr. Trosse's admirers: so that I hope the title-maker has mistaken the Doctor; and I the rather think thus, because a little after this, p. 294. speaking of the Scripture-account of these matters, the Doctor expresses himself more modestly and warily, viz. There we find some touches as to a Trinity in the Deity.

As for Mr. Trosse, I had no knowledge of him, but suppose him a person of conscience, and of great esteem, from the care some have taken of these fragments; and I hope the worst inference, that any man can make from what I have said or done, can be no more, than that probably I may judge him so weak and so honest, as to believe his own arguments to be valid.



NOTES



NOTES

ON

Mr. TROSSE's Catechism.

Of JESUS CHRIST.

Trosse.

MANY in our days deny the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Resp. But not those who own Christi- See Vol. 1. anity, and who believe that God has made him Lord and Christ; to the glory of the Father, who has set him a God over all. P. 83. Acts 2. 36. 1 Cor. 15. 27.

Tr. If Christ were not God, he could not, by his own power, overcome the devil and the world.

Resp. 1. Why, may not one below the supreme God overmatch the evil spirit?

2. What if Christ cast out Satan by his Father's power, or the finger and spirit of God? It is but what Christ says Luke 11. 20.

Tr. He could not, then, have waded thro' the wrath of God.

Resp. 1. God was never wroth with Christ, who did all things well, and was even as a sacrifice well-pleasing to him. God was not his terror, but his great and only comfort and joy in his worst sufferings. I am not alone, says he, because the Father is with me. Eph. 5. 2. Joh. 16.

2. Again, If Christ were supreme God, whose wrath could hurt him? for what is infinite can't

VOL. II.

E c

suffer,

434 Notes on Mr. Trosse's Catechism.

Answer to suffer, nor can make infinite satisfaction by becoming infinitely miserable. These notions have no place in Scripture, but are the wild fancies of ignorant men.

Tr. *Nor could he have purchased any good for sinners.*

Rom. 3. *Resp.* But he could, and did procure of God, that we might *freely by his grace be justified*; and have the *free* gift of eternal life, which is as *freely* given by the *Father*, as by the *Son*.

Tr. *The deniers of our Lord's godhead are, in this, not a whit better than Jews and Mahometans.*

Resp. Glorious charity! What, is it not better to take Christ for our Lord and Mediator, next to God; and to honour, and love, and trust in him, as one fully impower'd to rule and save us; than to curse, and hate, and crucify him, as a devilish impostor and blasphemer? Much more, if you believe but *one* God, a *Tritheist* may tell you, this is no better than the *Jews* and *Mahometans* believe in this particular; and must we therefore have other Gods, like *Pagans*?

Tr. *Christ is God's own, his begotten, his only Son: now, we know, true proper sons are of the self-same nature with their parents.*

Resp. And we know true sons are always of *two* parents, and have distinct beings, and are other men. It is absurd to conceive of a proper generation, &c. after the manner of men or beasts,

Jam. 1. in the great God. God *begets* Christians, and 18. Christ's human nature, is his own *begotten Son*; Luk. 1. that which *shall be born* (*γεννημεναι*) or begotten, of 35. *thee, shall be called the Son of God*. Nor is Christ Heb. 1. 5. called *begotten* in Scripture before, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*. Yet this temporal begetting was not of one of the *self-same nature,*

nature, but likeness: nor is a son always of equal power and glory with his father.

Tr. *Christ says*, I and my Father are one, *John* 10. 30.

Resp. *Calvin* says, this place is abused, when interpreted against the *Arians*; and *Christ* tells how they two are one, *John* 17. 22. even as many Christians may become one.

Tr. *The peculiar titles and names of God are given to Christ*, viz. *God*, *John* 1. 1.

Resp. 1. This is not peculiar to the Supreme. See *John* 10. 34.

2. Even in this text he is distinguished from *The God*. See the Answer to Dr. Bennet on the Trinity, p. 331.

Tr. *He is the true God*, 1 *John* 5. 20. and *the great God*, *Tit.* 2. 13. and *God, blessed over all*, *Rom.* 9. 5.

Resp. The two former are plainly said, not of *Christ*, but of his Father, *Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*, *Joh.* 17. 3. and we find the appearance of the Father's glory, distinct from *Christ's* glory. The last text is doubtful, and if said of *Christ*, the same *St. Paul* explains it, with limitation. He is accepted, &c. 1 *Cor.* 15. 27.

Tr. *The title of Lord is given him, which is the word by which the Seventy render Jehovah.*

Resp. 1. But this title is inferior to that of *God*. See 1 *Cor.* 8. 5.

2. Then the *Lord said to my Lord*, will imply two *Jehovahs*, if *Kύριος*, *Lord*, mean *Jehovah*; and *Lord of Lords*, will be *Jehovah of Jehovahs*, *Rev.* 9. 16.

Tr. But many passages, appropriated to *Jehovah* in the Old Testament, are ascribed to *Christ* in the new. *Pf.* 68. 18. *Isa.* 6. Numb. 21. 5, 6.

Resp. But what wonder is this, if these were

436 Notes on Mr. Trosse's Catechism.

spoken of Christ, as personating *Jehovah*, and bearing his name? And did the supreme God receive gifts for men? See for this, Dr. Bennet's discourse of the Trinity, c. 7. As for *Heb. 1. 10, 11.* it appears not that 'tis said of Christ. See the Answer to Dr. Bennet, p. 339

Tr. The peculiar works of God are ascribed to Christ; as, first, creation of all things, *Joh. 1. 3. Col. 1. 16.*

See Vol. 1. p. 197. Resp. 'Tis only by him, as the Medium and instrument in the formation of things under God; *Eph. 1. 9. who, as the principal, created all things by Jesus Christ.* And so for the next thing.

Tr. Secondly, Preservation, *Heb. 1. 3.*

Resp. 'Tis rather governing all, and 'tis in the same way.

Tr. Thirdly, Ruling all things, *Matt. 28. 18.*

Resp. But 'tis said to be by all power given him of the Father, which confutes the argument 'tis brought for. So *Phil. 2. 10. God gave him a name above all; and Acts 2. 36. God made him both Lord and Christ, and to him the Son himself shall acknowledge his subjection by a solemn surrender.*

Tr. Fourthly, Miracles, real miracles, *Joh. 5. 36. and he gave that power to others also.*

Resp. True, they bear witness that the Father sent him, as the words say, but not that he was the self-same God, for his disciples also wrought miracles; and greater works than I do shall they do, says our Lord. They also gave the power to

Acts 8. 18, others, but they did it in Christ's name, and 19. Christ in his Father's name: I come in my Father's

name; as the Father sent me, so send I you, — Joh. 5. 43. receive ye the Holy Ghost. I'll pray the Father, and Joh. 20. 21. 22. he shall give you another comforter.

Tr. Vanquishing wicked angels, *Col. 2. 15.*

Rev. 12. 7, 9. Resp. Michael and his angels may overcome the

the dragon, called *Satan*, and yet not be equal to God; and even Christ cast out devils by the finger of God; and so did the seventy disciples by power from Christ; *the devils are subject to us*, but all thro God's power. Luk. 10. 17.

The design of all this, is not to level the Lord Jesus Christ with the Apostles, but to shew how far such things are from being proper to God. If Christ had not said, *I can of my self do nothing*, but had said, that without power granted him from the Father, he could do all independently, it had been to the purpose to prove what is peculiar to God, but else not. Joh. 5. 30.

The other works, of *sanctification, regeneration, perseverance, salvation, resurrection, and judging men and angels*, and the like, will easily be accounted for, by the power granted by God to him, as mediator: so that even by the man Christ Jesus, shall God judge the world. But still, God the Father is the great Judge of all, and Christ is only the delegated judge. John. 5. 22, 27. Acts 17. 31. Heb. 12.

Tr. But the attributes peculiar to the eternal God, are ascribed to the Lord Jesus Christ; as,

First, *Eternity*, John 1. 1. *in the beginning the Word was*, Prov. 8. 22—31. Heb. 9. 14.

Resp. But how comes in the beginning, to signify without beginning? Before the beginning, of this creation, is not a strict eternity; and if all matter were capable of having been created from eternity, (as some conceive) this would not render it our God, by being eternal. And this text, Prov. 8. 22. by the Seventy, and the primitive Christian writers, was constantly read, *Thou hast created me the beginning of thy ways*; and so Col. 1. 15. *Christ is the first-born of all the creation*; and the eternal Spirit, Heb. 9. 14. is the Holy Spirit in most

438 + Notes on Mr. Trosse's Catechism.

copies; and yet this denotes but everlasting Spirit neither.

Tr. Secondly, *Immutability*, Heb. 1. 12, 13.

Resp. This only speaks continuance; and so does immortality in the saints and angels, who cannot die, Luke 20. 36. But where is the eternal immutability? Was not Christ of rich made poor, and for a little while lower than angels: and then again crowned with glory above them? Is here no shadow of turning, no varying?

2 Cor. 8.

9.
Heb. 2. 9.

Tr. Thirdly, *Omnipresence*, Mat. 28. 20. John 3. 13.

See Vol. I.
p. 358.

Resp. The last text is justly rendred, the Son of man who was in heaven; for so the word is rendred, John 9. 25. I was blind; compare Chap. 6. 62.

But allowing Christ to be with his disciples on earth, when ascended to heaven, it is with his assisting grace, by the power and spirit of the Father: and what is even a direct presence to all on this spot of earth, this drop of a bucket, to the filling heaven, and the heaven of heavens, never said of Jesus Christ, but of God? Is not the sun present to more than this earth, by far?

2 Tim. 2.
26.

Eph. 2. 2.

Does not one devil lead all sinners captiva; and one evil spirit work in the children of disobedience? And cannot Christ excel him, and yet be not supreme and infinite? And how did the

Joh. 6. 38.

Son come down from heaven to take a body, if omnipresent?

Tr. Fourthly, *Omniscience*, John 2. 25. Mat. 9. 4

1 Cor. 12.
10.

Resp. But did not the Apostles also discern the Spirits, by gift from God?

Vol. I. p.
188.

And did Christ know the day of judgement? Of that day knows not the Son, but my Father only.

Mark. 13.

32.

Rev. 5.

Rev. 1. 1.

Tho now the Lamb has open'd the seal'd book, and the Father may have revealed such matters to him. He only knows all things originally,

ginally, and immediately, and so is the *only* wife.

Tr. *Fifthly, Omnipotency, Rev. 1. 8.*

Resp. That text is not said of Christ, but the Father, who is described by that character, *ver. 4. who is, was, and is to come*, in distinction from Jesus Christ; yet Christ is, and was endowed with all power, but from the Father; *God anointed him Acts 10. with power, and he went about healing, &c. for 38. God was with him.* The title *Almighty, Παντοκράτωρ*, is in the antient creeds appropriated to God the Father, never applied to Christ.

Tr. *But, in the last place, religious worship, that appertains only to the Deity, is given to him.*

Resp. Then it must be *supreme* and *ultimate* worship, for the man Christ may have *inferior* worship.

Tr. *viz. First, trust and confidence; believe in God, and in me, John 14. 1.*

Resp. So *Exod. 14. ult. They believed in the Lord and in his servant Moses*, as in the Hebrew; yet our faith rests not here, without passing thro' Christ to God, as the ultimate object, *who thro' 1 Pet. 1. him do believe in God that raised him, that your hope 21. might be in God.*

Tr. *Secondly, Prayer, 1 Cor. 1. 3. Grace be to you from our Lord Jesus Christ, Acts 7. 59.*

Resp. 1. As for the first text, it may as well be said, prayer is made to the *seven Spirits*, or *Angels*, (the Lamb's seven eyes) *Grace be to you from the Rev. 1. 4. seven Spirits, which are before his throne.* It seems c. 5. 6. rather a wish, or else all prayer is not peculiar to God, but only when he is the ultimate object of prayer.

2. We ask nothing of Jesus Christ directly and ultimately, but as one empower'd by, and interceding with the Father, *In that day ye shall John 16. ask me nothing; whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in 23. my name, he will give it you.* We present sacri-

Heb. 12. 15. fices to him, but then it is as to our High Priest, that he may present them to his Father; and in this we honour and do homage to him, under the supreme.

Tr. *Thirdly, Bodily adoration,* Rev. 1. 17. Phil. 2. 10.

Acts 10. 35. Resp. But this was oft given to creatures; refused indeed by Peter, but not censured.

Tr. *Fourthly, Baptizing into his name,* Mat. 28. 19.

Resp. 1. Baptizing is but the way of disciplining men, as that text intimates; and there is nothing in it that implies the person must be God Almighty, to whom disciples are made; our Lord Jesus tells them, he had a commission from the Father, and therefore bids them go and lift men for the service of the great King, under himself, who was commission'd by him; and under the Holy Spirit, which was the seal and ratification of his commission. So the Jews were, in effect, baptized into Moses, and were Moses's disciples:

1 Cor. 10. 2. Much more may the Lord Jesus (who is a greater law-giver, tho under God, and a Son in God's house, where Moses was but a servant) gather disciples.

2. And for his being join'd with the Father, it is common, in some religious matters, to join with God some of his retinue, and inferior beings.

Rev. 1. 4. Grace to you from God the Father, and from the 1 Tim. 5. 21. seven Spirits. I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus, and the elect Angels, that thou observe these things.

Tr. But it shews the perverseness of man, who dares deny a truth, clearer in Scripture than the light at noon-day, because it is not agreeable to carnal reason.

Resp. 1. But did any man yet ever use so many arguments to prove it was light at noon? or sweat and

and strain so to prove it; or end, and then begin again, as conscious that still the proof is defective? I doubt, this is rashly said.

2. And how is *carnal reason* offended at the notion? Is all reason carnal and wicked? Or is not the flesh as much now to be served, by receiving the fashionable opinions, as by the contrary? Is not the Deity of the Father, as great a curb to the carnal mind, as that of the Son? And are not the professors of this, as *carnal by envy and strife as any other men*? And there may be as much lazy sloth in taking up with what is first taught us; and as much pride in pretending to high faith, and in being ashamed to confess our old, long-defended opinions, to be at last but sad mistakes; as in any thing else.

Tr. But it makes the love of Christ more to be admired, that being essential God, he should become a miserable man, Phil. 2. 6, 9.

Resp. An infinite, ever-blessed, impassible God, Vol. 1. p. 364. 367. cannot be poor and miserable, nor empty himself of his eternal and necessary fulness, tho he were united to a poor man: But a glorious, inferior, subordinate person might indeed suffer loss and pain, not only relatively, but really, which is sensibly moving, and astonishing, self-denying love indeed.

Tr. But being God, he can easily save us; for he ever lives to make intercession for them that come to God by him, Heb. 7. 25. And if Christ be God, he is almightily prevalent with his Father.

Resp. This argument confutes itself; for, does the supreme God's ability lie in saving us, by making *intercession* with another? Is not his own power prevalent enough of itself? But this shews, that Christ is sufficient to save us, as a *subordinate Mediator* with the Most High; and as such, he is worthy to be trusted in, worthy to be obey'd,
to

442 Notes on Mr. Trosse's Catechism.

to be believ'd in all he says, to be loved above father and mother, and life itself, and to be
 Rev 5.13. owned as our Saviour; and worthy is the Lamb slain, to have blessing, and honour, and glory, and power ascribed to him for ever; after him who sits
 Heb. 8. 1. upon the throne of imperial majesty; on the right hand of which throne, the Lord Jesus is set on high.

So that all the merits of his life, and death are not gone, nor all the truth of his doctrine lost, if he be still in this capacity, able to save to the utmost, such as come by him to God. It is a poor argument to say, *It is impossible a mere finite creature can satisfy an infinite God for sin.* For a perfectly infinite creature is not to be found, and an infinite God is impassible. And where is infinite satisfaction required?

Not moved then with ignorant, tragical exclamations, or with scurrilous, insulting reproaches, of being *liars, blasphemers, renouncers of God himself,* and *anticristian wretches,* that pretend to be *Christians,* and such horrid language; we still assert, that we own *Jesus is the Christ,* tho we do it to the glory of the Father; and so, deny neither the Father, nor the Son; and hope we shall be accepted of both, whom we love, and serve, and wait for; and shall not fare the worse for the rash judgment of uncharitable and confident men.

NOTES



NOTES

ON

Mr. TROSSE's Sermon.

Trosse.

I*T is said, Phil. 2. 6. That Christ was equal to God, and thought it no robbery so to be: Now he that is equal to God, must be God.*

Resp. Nothing but another God can be equal to God; and *Who in heaven can be compared to Ps. 89. 6. the Lord? Who among the sons of the Gods? The Vol. I. words render'd equal to God, should be like to P. 92. God; the text expresses Christ's humility, in that he did not eagerly and hastily catch at this likeness and form of God, as men do at their prey; but waving his glorious, god-like majesty, he submitted to suffer the death of the cross, as if he had been a slave, or in the form of a servant.*

Tr. But if he be the smallest matter inferior to God, he must be infinitely inferior to him; nothing, and less than nothing, in comparison of him.

Resp. Forasmuch as all sides confess some inferiority in the relation of Son, and some pre-eminence in the Father, by which he is greater, in deference to Christ's own words, *John 14. 28.* I think this conclusion is very daring: I durst not use such degrading words of the Lord of glory,
(much

(much more so, than calling him a *creature*) and shall leave this inference to them who are so desperately bold as to make it; and am sorry to find there are any such.

Tr. He has all the attributes of the Godhead ascribed to him; and is equal to God himself.

Resp. Is self-existence, independence, &c. ascribed to him? Is he said to be the *Lord God of Gods*, Josh. 22. 22? Is he said to have known all futurities, even the *day of judgment*, as the Father? Is the Father's honour and worship said to be to the *glory of the Son*, as the ultimate end? Is it ever said to us, *There is but one God*, and he is the Son, as is said of the Father? Is he ever called, *The God of the Father*, as the Father is the *Head and God of our Lord Jesus Christ*, 1 Cor. 11. 3. 2 Cor. 11. 31? Could the Son do all things *of himself*, John 5. 30? or, Did he give to the Father, to have life in himself, *ver. 26.* as the Father gave to him? Are these no marks of different attributions?





Of the HOLY SPIRIT.

Tr. **F**ROM the Scripture there are many and clear proofs of the Deity of the Holy Ghost, or Spirit.

Resp. There are so many different senses of the word *Spirit* in Scripture, that 'tis absurd from the Deity of the Spirit in one sense, to argue for it in all the rest. God the Father is himself an *Holy Spirit*; his power is the *Holy Ghost* or *Spirit*: for, to make the third person Christ's Father, will confound the whole Gospel, and the manifestation of God's power and energy, in the communications of miraculous gifts, of wisdom, power, and holy elevations of zeal, or in holy inspirations, are commonly called *his Spirit*, that fell, was poured out, or came on Christians, &c. in the New Testament history; in which sense, the *Holy Ghost* was not yet, as 'tis said, *John 7. 39. before Christ was glorified.* Joh. 4. 24.
Ps. 139. 7.
Luke 1. 35.

Now none of these are the *Spirit*, in the sense of another person distinct from the Father, and therefore characters and works attributed to the former, are no proof of the Deity of the latter; so that, most of the proofs here brought, are to no more purpose, than that from *Psal. 36. 6. By the breath of his mouth.* For, to God and his power, many greater things may be ascribed, than to another distinct person, who yet is a Spirit, and of which the question now

in hand is, whether *he* be the supreme God?

Tr. He is expressly called God, Acts 5. 3, 4.

Resp. Not at all; but the Father is the God *lied unto*, by lying to his Spirit and Ministers, or to those whom he had inspired, and who acted from him; as *1 Thess. 4. 8. i. e.* it redounds to this in the consequence, *Luke 10. 16.* that 'tis against God himself.

Tr. Things said of Jehovah in one text, are ascribed to the Holy Ghost in another.

Resp. Well may God be said to speak what a messenger by his order speaks; or what is spoken by his inspiration.

Tr. Sin is said to be committed against the Holy Ghost, and such sins too, as are unpardonable, Mat. 12. 32. Now sin is committed against God only.

Resp. 1. Surely one man may sin against his neighbour, *1 Sam. 2. 25.* and against his own soul and conscience.

2. But yet there is no such word in Scripture as *sin against the Holy Ghost*, who is never styled our Lord, or Law-giver there: 'Tis only said, *he who speaks against the Holy Ghost, and blasphemeth; — which is a great sin against God.*

3. Besides, 'tis the power and finger of God in miraculous operations, that is the Holy Ghost mentioned there, and which some reviled and called the power of the Devil; and that before ever the person, viz. the comforter, came. And,

4. The unpardonableness of it was not because it terminated on the Holy Spirit, as if he were a more formidable object than the Father, but because it was a sin against God, under the *biggest aggravations*, in contempt of the strongest arguments of conviction; as
if

if one should say. Other sins against God may find easier pardon; but he who sins against his conscience, it shall hardly be forgiven him, tho' conscience is not God; So he who sins and blasphemes against the Holy Ghost, and tramples on the most convincing evidence and credentials that could be given, offends God above all.

Tr. *Divine Worship is ascribed to the Holy Ghost, viz. First, Baptism, Mat. 28. 19.*

Resp. This, I have before shewn, does not prove the point.

Tr. Secondly, *Prayers are made to him, 2 Cor. 13. 14. The communion (or communication) of the Holy Ghost be with you. Rev. 1. 4. Grace be to you, and peace from the seven Spirits before the throne.*

Resp. The former text contains but a pious wish of spiritual gifts; and it might as well be said, when St. Paul writes, *Grace be with you all, Amen, Col. 4. 18. Heb. 13. 25.* that it is a prayer made to *Grace*.

And as to the latter, it proves *seven Spirits* Vol. I. p. to be God, if any at all, which is something too many, and above two Trinities of persons; and yet they are not on the Throne with God, but stand before his Throne, and are seven elect Angels, whose kind ministry St. John wishes to the Churches *.

And therefore, if the Holy Ghost be never called *God*, be never *prayed to* in Scripture; if we are never called the *servants*, nor *church*, nor *kingdom*, nor *people* of the Holy Spirit; if

* Rev. 5. 6. They are called the *seven Spirits of God, sent forth into all the earth*, so that they are employed in a ministerial capacity, or as it is expressed Heb. 1. 14. *They are ministering Spirits sent forth to minister for them, who shall be heirs of salvation.*

if never required to *pray*, nor give *thanks*, nor *praise* to the Holy Spirit (but to God for and by his Spirit) and only are bid to be *guided* by, and not to *quench*, nor *grieve the Spirit*; as may be said also of our own conscience: If so, then what ground is there for all Mr. Trosse's inferences of *prayer*, and giving *thanks* for all to the Holy Ghost, and joining him with the Father in *all* our devotions? If any such things might justly be inferred from Christian principles, surely the Apostles were as much concerned as any, to make such inferences, and to have put 'em in practice, for our imitation; and to have left us some little more express precedent of praying to the *one Spirit*, than to the *seven Spirits*.

And thou, O Heavenly Father, give thy Holy Spirit to all who ask it of thee, that among all Christians, the fruits of the Spirit may be love, peace, long-suffering, goodness, gentleness, and meekness!





P O S T S C R I P T

A Word or two to the gentleman behind in the *Postscript*.

Dr. *Sherlock* has over and over declared,
 “ That the three divine Persons, are three di-
 “ stinct, infinite, eternal Minds or Spirits; and
 “ that ’tis *heresy* and *nonsense* to judge other-
 “ wise.”

And Dr. *South* (to the Bishops) “ Your Lord-
 “ ships cannot but know, that *Tritheism* is worse
 “ and more reproachful to Christianity, not on-
 “ ly than *Sabellianism*, but even than *Socinianism*
 “ itself, as being contrary to all natural as well
 “ as revealed religion. By destroying the funda-
 “ mental article of *Doct. 2. The unity of the*
 “ *Godhead*; which *Socinianism* doth not in-
 “ croach upon: and yet, in a further degree,
 “ it is worse than *Arianism*.” *Preface before the*
History of Valentinus Gentilis the Tritheist.

By which it appears, that however Dr. *South*
 and Dr. *Sherlock*, or (if it pleases better) Dr.
Owen and Mr. *Howe*, agreed in using the bare
 words *One God*, and that the *Father*, *Son*, and
Spirit, are that *One God*; yet they differ’d
 widely in their sense (which is their real Faith)
 and in their explications of the doctrine of the
Trinity; and that each side esteems the *Arians*,
 nay, *Socinians*, better than the other, as better
 Christians or wiser men: but it had been very
 strange indeed, if those men had resolved the
unity of the Godhead into God the *Father*, who

held no unity, but of *three Gods*, if three distinct infinite minds be such; and if this be not so, I wonder what is.

But if Dr. *Owen* or Dr. *Sherlock* did it not, 'tis much better if St. *Paul*, long before 'em, did thus resolve the unity of the Godhead into God the Father, by saying *To us* (Christians) *there is but One God, even the Father, and but one Lord Jesus Christ*, 1 Cor. 8. 6.

And that *one* supreme God, may consist with *one* subordinate, is no just difficulty to one who is for the *Nicene Creed*, *God of God*; or for that text, *Heb. i. 8, 9. O God—thy God hath anointed thee*.

And Dr. *Sherlock* (to the Bishops) "Your Lordships cannot but know, that *Trinitarianism* is worse, and more repugnant to Christianity, not only than *Arianism*, but even than *Deism*. Itself, as being contrary to all nature as well as reason, is revealed religion, destroying the fundamental articles of the Christian religion, which is not in itself, but in a further degree, *crucial* upon it; and it is worse than *Arianism*. Preface before the History of *Valentinus Gessius* the Pious."

By which it appears, that however Dr. *Sherlock* and Dr. *Sherlock* or (if it please better) Dr. *Owen* and Mr. *Moore* agreed in using the same words *Our God*, and that the Father, Son, and Spirit, are that *One God*; yet they differed widely in their sense (which is their real Faith) and in their explications of the doctrine of the Trinity; and that each side esteems the other now *Deist*, better than the other as better *Trinitarian* of wiser men; but it had been very strange indeed, if those men had retained the unity of the Godhead into God the Father, who held

CONTENTS

SECTION I.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

Dr. Waterland's NOTIONS

SECTION II.

*In relation to Polytheism, Ditheism,
the Son's Consubstantiality with,
and Inferiority to the Father.*

Being some Short Notes left imperfect by the
AUTHOR.

SECTION IV.

1731.

CONTENTS.

SECT. I.

Polytheism by Dr. Waterland's Principles.

1. *He is driven to deny the Unity of God to be an article of natural religion.* 2. *He subverts the only foundation, on which, he says, the Fathers asserted the Unity of God.* 3. *He has advanced a notion of Three infinite divine persons, not to be distinguished from Three infinite Gods.*

SECT. II.

As to Dr. Waterland's objection of Ditheism to the Unitarians.

SECT. III.

Of the Son's consubstantiality with the Father.

SECT. IV.

Of the Son's inferiority to the Father, in answer to Dr. Waterland.

I. *In the gospel history he appears with evident marks of subjection, at his coming down from heaven, at his return to heaven, and after his exaltation there.*

II. *The primitive Fathers constantly own him to have ministred to the Father, to be his angel or messenger, and to be under his command.*



SECTION I.

The Polytheism of Doctor Waterland's Principles.

I. **H**E is driven to deny the *Unity* of God to be an article of *natural* religion, or proveable by the light of nature; he yields only, that it is *probable*. See his remarks on Dr. Clark's exposition of the church catechism, p. 65. And by his Vindicator, Mr. Brown, *Demonstrate* (says he by way of challenge) *that there can be but one all-perfect being*. Indeed this became absolutely necessary to him, because he saw, I doubt not, that there is no way by the light of reason to prove *One God* or infinite all-perfect being, but what will as strongly prove, that there can be but *One infinite Person*; nor is there any way by reason to confute the doctrine of *three* infinite eternal omnipresent beings, but what will confute the notion of *three* infinite divine persons.

Animad-
vers. on
two pieces
p. 16.

Let him or any man try this point, and he will find, that *three infinite Gods* may be conceiv'd to agree, as well as *three persons* with three concordant wills, &c. and *One* infinite divine *all perfect person* is all-sufficient and all that is necessary, as much as *One God* is so; and whatever will answer the objections made against *three almighty divine persons* will as well answer all objections against *three infinite Gods*, so that by the light of reason the

notion of three infinite *Gods* or of three infinite *persons* will stand and fall together. Now the consequence of this is very grievous, for it will then follow,

Rom. 1.
20.

Acts 14.
17.

1. That the heathen world were not faulty nor without excuse in having *Gods many*, and in not glorifying the *one* true God, as St. Paul judged. It seems they could not discern *his* eternal power and Godhead from the works of the creation any more than that of many *other* Gods, and if they worshipped never so *many*, (and consequently *no* *supreme* one at all) they did not act against reason upon the Doctor's principle. It was not owing it seems to the blindness of their evil minds or their corrupted hearts, but only to the defect of the evidence, which God had afforded them, so that he had left himself without witness to the nations, else they might see (and indeed many of them did see) that God was but *One*, and *One Person* too.

2. This weakens the good principle which remains among sober *Deists*, viz. the belief of the *One* true God, who made the heavens and earth, &c. 'Tis pity they should be driven from it to *Pagan* polytheism; I should think it were better to have men brought to the *Jewish* or *Mahometan* faith in the *One* God, (tho' they unhappily reject the light of revelation) than to be wandering after a multitude of strange gods, idols, or fictions. The Doctor's principles represent the one as proveable as the other, and tend to bring such back into the grossest *Paganism*.

II. To shew his *polytheism* the Doctor is ready to subvert the *only* foundation, on which he says* the primitive Fathers asserted the *Unity of God*, and without which he owns the antients would give it up. *Two un-originate divine persons*,
says

* 2d Def. p. 202.

says he *, *however inseparable*, would be two gods according to the *Antients*; and thus he constantly states the case †. If then the Word, or second person, were not *eternally generated*, or derived from the Father as his head and fountain, and yet *eternally existed*, there must be two gods in the sense of the Doctor and the *Antients*.

But tho the Doctor inclines (with some only of the Fathers ‡) to an *eternal generation*, yet he seems very indifferent || whether this point be held or not, and grants it was not clear nor generally held by the Fathers, many of whom speak only of a *temporal generation* or mission of the Son at the creation of the world, and that the Catholics were pretty much divided about this question, but that ATHANASIUS having strenuously argued for it, and the generality of the Catholics having weighed the advantage given to the ARIANS by supposing the LOGOS to be unbegotten, they came into that notion, and so *eternal generation* came to be the more prevailing language, and has prevailed ever since. § What a pitiful foundation is here for the belief of the *eternal generation*, asserted chiefly to cover themselves from a charge of Polytheism by the *Arians*; it seems it was not revelation, but politic necessity drove Athanasius and others to make this an article of faith; and so the Doctor is ready to leave it indifferent, tho the divine unity must go with it: for If any, says he, dislike the phrase of *eternal generation*, and think it better to assert an eternal Word instead of an eternal Son, (meaning thereby a distinct person and consubstantial with God, whose Word he is) there seems to be no harm in it |||, notwithstanding the consequence aforesaid; for

F 4

* 2d. Def. p. 207. † Def. p. 84. ‡ 2d Def. p. 314.
 || Def. p. 158. & 161. § Def. p. 160. 2d Def. p. 317.
 ||| Def. p. 161.

tho he is willing to take up with the eternal co-existence of the *Logos*, without the relation of a *Son*, (which the Antients and Bp. Pearson did not take up with) yet the eternal co-existence of the *Logos*, tho it were a consubstantial person, would not prevent *two co-ordinate Gods*, because they might still be *two unbrigate persons*; nor is it enough that they are called *God and his Word*, for that notes *relation* only, not *origination* and *derivation*, which is the only matter pleaded as a *salvo* for the divine unity of two persons *, and therefore of all those primitive writers, who have nothing of any *eternal generation* or *Son*, (nor have the Scriptures any thing about it) it must be said, they either held not *two co-ordinate divine persons*, or else are not clear of *polytheism* by the Doctor's account; but I judge they were clear by holding neither *two co-ordinate persons* nor any *Son* by such *eternal generation* †.

But the Doctor, by being indifferent about this *eternal generation* (the only *salvo*, as he says, with the Antients for the divine unity) shows he is too indifferent for the point of *Unity*, at least he is not much moved at parting with the main support of it; he must not therefore think to put us off with a co-eternal existence and *relation* of the Word without *generation* and *natural* subordination of the *Son* to the *Father* ‥. And this I think, shews those Fathers did not mean such a *consubstantiality of one stock* as the Doctor pleads for §, because if *God and his Word* were supposed to be *one* and the *same substance*, that alone, without any thing more, had rendered them *One God*, whether derived one from the other or not, but since they thought it necessary, that one should be *originated* from the other in order to secure their notion of *One God*, it appears they placed

* Def. p. 84. † Def. p. 158. ‥ 2d Def. p. 283. 4.
§ 2d Def. p. 207.

the unity in the subordination of distinct beings, viz. because of *one dominion* or monarchy by a subordination or inferiority of one to the other, (which hinders not *unity* of government, as *three co-ordinate* rulers would, which they would be, if one were not related to the other as his *head* and *cause*, and *Father*,) and not in the *sameness of substance*, which needed not the derivation to make out an unity: Whereas the Doctor relies on the unity of *substance* for proof of the Father and Son being One God, and his allowing the *origination* of the Son from the Father seems only in complaisance to the Ancients, (whose notion of *consubstantiality* was not sufficient to hinder them from being *two Gods* in their account,) and therefore he is so easy in complaisance to his friends to dispense with it, as not *fundamental* or very *material**: Else let him show that those many ancient writers, who own no other but a *temporal generation* of the Son, did ever mention any *derivation* of the personal Word from the First person, as *head* and *cause*, antecedent to such *temporal* generation, or *exertion*, or *mission to make and then to govern the creatures*, as he speaks†. If not, they either held the Father and Son not to be *co eternal* and *co-equal*, or holding them so without the one eternal original, they held *two unoriginate* persons, i. e. in the sense of the Fathers || *two Gods*, by Bishop Pearson's § and Dr. Waterland's ||| own confession.

III. The Doctor has advanced a notion of *three infinite divine persons* and intelligent agents, which men cannot distinguish from that of *three infinite Gods*, and so is the very same thing in meaning, while under different terms. For faith is internal, not the words but the *sense* and meaning; with the *heart man believes*: whoever therefore believes in

Rom. 10.
10.

the

* 2d. Def. p. 525, 6. and p. 529. † 2d. Def. p. 316.

|| See Bing. Orig. Ecclef. Vol. 4. Lib. 11. cap. 3. sect. 4.

§ On the creed, p. 40. ||| 2d. Def. p. 207.

the sense of *three* divine beings or *Gods*, tho he says *three persons*, is a Tritheist still. Now let him, if he can, give any notion of *three divine persons* different from that of *three Gods*, so that each shall not cause the same ideas in men's minds; he may give them *different names*, viz. *three Gods* and *three persons*; but there will be, I think, the *same conceptions* in our minds: *To God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost*, let any one judge whether this be not all that men could or would say, if speaking to *three Gods*. The only difference he pretends to is, that *three divine beings or Gods* means *three separate substances or spirits*, and *three divine persons* are *substance, substance, and substance*, but being *undivided* and not *separate*, are but *one substance* in union, tho distinguished by several properties*. But this will never make a difference, because three infinite *Gods*, or divine beings, can never be separated, more than three such *persons*; three infinite *Gods*, or immense omnipresent beings, must needs pervade each other, and can never be divided in substance, they can only be distinguished by *personal* properties, as three persons are said to be. Nor is God separated from any angel or man, only that they are not infinite and omnipresent; but by his perfections and operations he is manifest to be *another being and person* from them. So three infinite *Gods* would not be distinguished by the *essential* perfections (which would be the same in kind, and united by a *συμπληρωματικὴ* inseparable) but by some *personal* properties; and so it is here, the three persons are distinguished by separate characters, *one mediates, another commands, one sends, another is sent, one is incarnate, another is not so, one begotten, another unbegotten*, agreeing with each other,

* 2d Def. p. 454.

other, says the Doctor *, upon an *economy*; so that the case is just alike, *three infinite separate beings* is a contradiction so plain, that natural light discerns it; but according to the Doctor *three Gods* is not so discernable by natural reason to be a contradiction, and consequently with him doth not imply *three infinite separate beings*, but all may be *one undivided inseparable substance* still and yet *three Gods*; and thus they will be the same as three united undivided persons in respect of separation and union. So then the three divine persons are as much *separated*, as three divine beings would be, and three Gods as much *united* as his three persons; but if because their *substance is undivided*, they are not *three Gods* †, then sure since there cannot be three divided infinite beings or Gods, he might by natural light prove there can be no more than *One infinite Being or God*.

So that I see not but three infinite divine persons are as much three beings, as three Gods could be conceived to be, each all-wise, almighty, &c. one knowing the other, agreeing in *economy*, one is not the other, only one in *kind*, but mutually in each other; and were it not for the shame that Christians should in express words contradict the current of the Bible, I can't see why they, who are of the Doctor's sentiments, may not say, *three Gods and one God, three beings and one God, or three beings and one person, or three persons and one person*, as well as *three persons and yet but one substance* or one being. Indeed the Doctor has said what is very like it, *three infinite intelligent individual agents*, and yet *but one infinite intelligent undivided agent*, which he stoutly justifies ‖, as being all in *one undivided substance*. Here is the same contradiction as *three Gods and but one God, three persons and but one person*, tho this he denies indeed,

* 2d. Def. p. 316. † 2d. Def. p. 357. ‖ Pref. to Sermon. p. 51. 2d. Def. p. 350.

indeed, saying, that *person and undivided intelligent agent are not reciprocal, and that undivided intelligent agent, like individual being, may admit several senses, and that we want a certain principle of individuation.* By the same rule, what hinders but he might say the term *God* admits of several senses? And then he might say *three Gods and one God, three personal Gods and one essential God, or three persons and one person* in several senses.

Indeed the Scriptures say only *There is one God*; it no more says, *He is three persons*, than *three substances or beings*, no more that he is *one substance and being*, than he is *one person*; the *Father, Son and Spirit* are as much represented to be *three beings*, as *three persons*; and if the Doctor imagines the *Father, Son and Spirit* to be included in the *One God*, (which he has not proved,) yet that will not determine, whether as *three persons* or as *three beings*, for why may not *three substances* be one *God*, as well as *three persons*? *All persons*, says he, *but these divine persons are separate substance**, and *they are persons of a different kind from all other persons†*. Why may not another chance to be as bold and rash on the other side, with as much reason and scripture too, and say, *All other substances or minds are separate in their nature, but the divine substances or minds are of another kind, and therefore they are three substances, tho' unseparate, and make but One God.* For there is no way to prove each of the three to be a *person* but by operations and distinct characters, *I, thou, he*, which as much proves the *One God* (indefinitely taken for all the three) to be *one person*, since in that sense the *personal* characters and operations are ascribed thereto||, and so the three will be one individual *person*, as altogether

* 2d. Def. p. 366. † Ibid. p. 369. || Dr. Waterland's Sermon. p. 133, 134.

ther in one God, and yet each an individual person; or each an individual *substance*, but all together one undivided substance, as in one God. I desire the Doctor to show me wherein distinction of *substances inseparable* interferes more with the unity of God, than distinction of *persons*, since, as the Doctor allows†, according to common language, as it has passed with mankind, a *person* in all other instances always denotes a *separate distinct substance*, as well as a *distinct separate intelligent substance* denotes a *person*. Nay, since the Doctor's notion of *person* in Christ allows *two intelligent substances* may make *one person*, it cannot with him be absurd that *three substances* should make *one divine person* or God.

If there cannot be three infinite beings or *substances*, because not separated, so that they can't be distinguish'd, then how can three infinite *persons* be distinguished any more for the same reason; and since, as the Doctor says, the *persons* are three, tho not divided, why may not the *substances* be three also, tho not divided? What is there wanting to make unity of *persons*, which is not as much wanting to make unity of *substance*? Or what will hinder *three substances* from being distinct, which will not also hinder *three persons* from being distinct? It is not the saying confidently, that the *union is different*, is enough, unless it be shewn wherein or why it is different; else if all be arbitrary, another may as well say the direct contrary: for if in both cases they are one because of no separation, then it will be *one person* as much as *one substance*, and if notwithstanding their inseparability they be *three persons*, by the same reason they may be *three substances*, tho not separate, and each supposition will alike infer *three Gods*; so that if there can be three infinite supreme Gods supposed,

† 2d. Def. p. 362.

supposed, it is so by the Doctor's scheme of three *persons* co-equal and co-infinite, distinct in their knowledge, will, and respective parts acted in the oeconomy he mentions.

Besides, if *distinction* of *persons* proves not a *distinction* of *substances*, then *separation* of *persons* proves not a *separation* of *substances*, and then how will it appear, that two men are two separate substances? All men may yet be *one substance*, tho *many persons* and *many men*; distance of place or condition hinders it not, for by the Doctor's scheme †, God's substance admits this, he is in sun and moon, is incarnate in one person and not in another: Why may not finite substance fill all the finite space of all men, or all the persons in that common substance, so that all human persons may be one substance in the Doctor's sense of unity, and yet as this leaves them to be *many men*, because distinct persons, so will the three persons be as much *three Gods*. We conclude the *substance* (unknown otherwise to us) to be as the *person*, and where the *person* is distinct in properties and acts, we infer the substance is so too; thus God, tho separate from no man, is yet a distinct substance, because of distinct condition and properties.

In short, to talk after the manner the Doctor does is arbitrarily to impose new senses upon words, contrary to their received meaning and custom of language, established by no authority, but that of the confidence of vain men, who first frame strange hypotheses, and then talk they *know not*, and almost *care not* what. I doubt not but it grieves good men to see the great and glorious God, and his incomprehensible nature so boldly and irreverently treated, as some mens notions of *substance* and *persons* in him unavoidably occasion,
for

† Def. p. 166.

for their notions must be mention'd and examin'd, when they press them so violently upon our belief: How much more becoming would it be to adore him with reverential silence, than to talk with scholastic babble of what they know not, and were never taught by him!

It is therefore a very evil thing to stuff creeds with paradoxes and unintelligible propositions; not to *edify*, but to *puzzle* and confound; to make articles of faith as like at least to contradictions as they can, and then to damn men for not believing them.

S E C T. II.

As to Dr. Waterland's Objection of Ditheism to the Unitarians.

THIS is no more than what was objected to the primitive Fathers, they were resolved against *two Gods*, and yet fully persuaded that Christ was *another* and *inferior* person to the Father, they could not forbear the terms *ἕτερος* and *διῆτερος*, *Alius* and *Secundus*, viz. *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Novatian*, *Lactantius*, &c.

N. B. It was not *Tritheism* which was objected to them, because the Deity of the Spirit was not yet in view, except in *Tertullian's* novel *Montanism* †. It was only the *Father* and *Son*, whom their adversaries pretended they made two Gods.

But

† After *Tertullian* became a *Montanist*, he held the Father, Son, and Spirit to be each of them God; but then he did not pretend, that this was the original Christian doctrine: On the contrary, he affirmed, he had learnt it by a new revelation from the *Paraclete*; "Nos enim maxime *Paracleti*, non hominum, discipuli duos quidem definimus Patrem & Filium, & JAM TRES cum Spiritu sancto secundum rationem economiz, quæ facit numerum." "We, says he, being especially the disciples of the *Paraclete*, not of men, hold the
" Father,

But this *Di-theism* was answered several ways, viz. That they are one by *consent*, by *subordination* in one monarchy and government: That they are of *one substance*; the Son being of the Father's substance, as a part of the whole is one still: Thus *Tertullian*. *Origen* is quite contrary, and is very unfairly represented by Dr. W. 2d. Def. p. 69. 109. He says indeed, in answer to the objection of two Gods, that the *Father and Son are not two but one*, from *John* 10. 30. *Cont. Cels.* lib. 8. p. 385. but *how* one? Not by unity of *substance*, as Dr. W. pretends, 2d. Def. p. 195. (for *substance* was not then thought of, but was brought

“ Father and Son to be two, and now with the Holy Spirit to be
 “ three, according to the method of the *oeconomy*, which makes
 “ up that number.” *Cont. Praxeam*, cap. 13. Nay, he seems
 to acknowledge, that tho’ he and other *Monanists* were in-
 lighten’d and better instructed, yet herein he was gone off
 from the simplicity of the Christian faith, as embraced by the
 body of Christians; “ *Simplices enim quippe, nē dixerim*
 “ *imprudētes & idiotas, quā major semper credentium pars*
 “ *est, quoniam & ipsa regula fidei à pluribus Diis seculi ad*
 “ *unicum & Deum verum transfert, non intelligentes unicum*
 “ *quidem, sed cum suā oeconomia esse credendum, expaves-*
 “ *cunt ad oeconomiam. Numerum & dispositionem trinitatis*
 “ *divisionem præsunt unitatis, quando unitas, ex semet*
 “ *ipsa derivans trinitatem, non destruat ab illā, sed admini-*
 “ *stratur. Itaque duos & TRES JAM jactitant à nobis præ-*
 “ *dicari, se verò UNUS Dei cultores præsunt, quasi non &*
 “ *unitas irrationaliter collecta hæresim faciat, trinitas rationa-*
 “ *liter expensa veritatem construat.*” “ Plain ordinary Chri-
 “ stians, says he, not to say inconsiderate and ignorant,
 “ which are always the greater part, are quite shock’d at the
 “ *oeconomy*, for that the very rule of faith it self leads us
 “ off from the many Gods of the Heathens to the one
 “ only true God, not comprehending that, tho’ God is in-
 “ deed to be believed but one, yet it must be so as to take in
 “ the *oeconomy*. They imagine number and order in the
 “ Trinity implies division of the Unity, whereas the Unity,
 “ deriving the Trinity from itself, is not destroy’d by it but
 “ administer’d. They give out therefore, that we preach up
 “ two, and now THREE Gods, but imagine themselves to be
 “ worshippers of ONE ONLY God, as if even the Unity impro-
 “ perly understood may not make heresy, and the Trinity
 “ rightly consider’d constitute truth. *Contra. Praxeam* cap. 3.

brought in afterwards, as the Doctor admits, 2d. Def. p. 449.) but by unity of *consent*, while still they were *two substances*: The unity of *substance* he expressly protests against, as what he could by no means endure, or be driven to, viz. *to deny the Father and the Son to be two substances*, (for so *hypostasis* then meant, as the Doctor allows, 2d Def. p. 453. See also *Cudw. Intel. Syst.* p. 603.) δύο ἔιναι ὑπεστάσεις πατέρα καὶ υἱόν, and therefore to prevent such misconstruction he explains those words of Christ, *I and my Father are one*, by the other words, *Acts* 4. 32. where believers are said to be *of one heart*; and to put it out of doubt elsewhere *De Orat.* c. 50. Origen says, they are δύο κατ' ὁσίαν, ἄλλος, and δεύτερος θεός. *Contr. Cels.* Lib. 5. p. 258. 318. Nay, *Tertullian* was almost ready to yield a *Ditheism*, but such as the Scriptures make, tho' he did not like to use the expression *two Gods*, because the Scriptures allow but *one God*: See 2d Def. p. 101. And therefore tho' he would call the Son *God*, when mention'd *singly*, yet when both were mention'd together he would call only the Father *God*, and the Son *Lord*. As, says he, I would call a ray of the sun, *the sun*, when I am speaking of it by itself, but when speaking of the sun, whose ray it is, I shan't presently call that ray *the sun*. *Contr. Prax.* c. 13.

In like manner the *Arians* deny *two Gods*, because but *one* in consent and dominion, tho' *two beings*; and to say *two Gods* usually means two of the *same* sort or rank, whereas the *Father* is God in an *higher* sense, and the *Son* is God in a *lower* sense. Dr. W. can say *God and God*, and one is not the other, yet both one and the same thing, but not *two Gods*. *Serm.* p. 148. He says it is, because of their being different *persons*, they, because of different *senses* and *degrees*. Now he can never

show any instance of several persons in one divine being, but others can shew the term *God* to be used in different senses, both current in Scripture, the *one* denoting the most high, the *other* in an inferior degree, which makes all plain and easy. This appears, 1. In the expression *God of Gods*, Deuter. 10. 17. Josh. 22. 22. Psal. 82. 1, 6. Psal. 97. 7. Psal. 136. 2. Sure not of *all the idols*, as the Doctor supposes, 2d Def. p. 197. It implies superiority and eminence, as *Song of songs*, *Lord of lords*, *King of kings*. Our Lord *Jesus* justifies this sense, John 10. 34, 35. when he allows those to be properly called *Gods*, unto whom the word of God came, not *nominal* but *real*, not *false* but *truly* *Gods* by power and dominion; so there be, that are not only called but really are *Gods*, 1 Cor. 8. 5. and yet *Jesus Christ* is *God* in a degree much superior to all these, being set by his *God and Father* at his own right hand, far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named not only in this world, but in that which is to come, Ephes. 1. 17, &c.

2. Heb. 1. 8, 9. O *God*, thy *God* hath anointed thee. Here is plainly one styled *God*, who has another as *God* over him to anoint him: Hence the Father is frequently called the *God of our Lord Jesus Christ*, but he is never called the *Father of God*, as *Jesus Christ* is called the *Son of God*.

3. Again, Psal. 110. 1. The *Lord* said unto my *Lord* (not *Jehovah* to *Jehovah*, but *Jehovah* to *Adonai*;) It is not said to his *Lord*, (as above in Heb. 1. thy *God*) but to my *Lord*, i. e. to David's *Lord*. Now is not a *Lord* and a *Lord* two *Lords*? And yet eminently there is but *One Lord*, Deut. 6. 4. Mark 12. 29. Hear, O *Israel*, the *Lord* our *God* is one *Lord*. And yet our

Lord *Jesus* is Lord of real lords too, for he is Lord of lords and King of Kings, Rev. 12. 14. and 19. 16.

S E C T. III.

Of the Son's Consubstantiality with the Father.

THIS is Dr. *Waterland's* great refuge to cover him in all distresses, on which he lays his main stress from the Fathers, but it is a vain foundation; for,

1. Some said it, and others denied it; some said they were *one substance*, others *two*. Def. p. 19.

2. They who said *one substance*, as *Tertullian*, meant not an equality of that substance in both, but said the Son was but a *portion*, and the Father *the whole*, just as a small ray or sun-beam was a part, but the body of the sun was the whole.

3. They still held the Son's *inferiority*, and therefore not *such* a consubstantiality as excluded the Son's *subjection*.

4. The Doctor shows how this controversy was managed *pro* and *con*, and with what struggle and great difficulty *three hypostases* prevail'd, and that but for custom *three substances* might have done as well. 2d Def. p. 453, 454, &c.

5. *Jerom* liked neither of them, not the *Greek* nor *Latin* words, *hypostases* nor *substantia*. *Hilary* was for *three substances*. But with the Doctor's supposed *salvo's* and right interpretations all spake well, whether they said *one substance*, or *not one*, yet to be sure they meant right say what they would; and so probably had *Arius*, if at that time. 2d Def. p. 452.

6. It seems the first and best writers were so wise as to say nothing about *substance* and *persons*, 2d Def. p. 449. so that it is all a novelty, only

468 *Observations on Dr. Waterland.*

from the times of *Praxeas*, *Noetus*, and *Sabellius*, as the Doctor hints. And what is it to us what this modern antiquity has said, tho' divided and not unanimous in it neither? Some for *numerical*, some for *specific* consubstantiality.

7. Whence had they these notions? not from *Scripture*, but their *vain*, their *false philosophy*, and *corporeal* notions of God's substance, as is plain in *Tertullian*, making the Son a part or portion of the Deity, tho' not parted or separate.

Finally, Neither these Fathers nor the Doctor know one word of what they talk about. Do they know what *God's substance* is? or what *any substance* is, that they or the Council of *Nice* should be so daring? Have they any idea of what they talk so confidently of? I may here use his own words, *Def. p. 329. You are to prove what you can know nothing of.* What is the substance of *intellect*, *will*, *life*, &c? So that it is a trifling deceitful foundation to build a creed or scheme upon, of no weight, no use, and ought to pass for nothing, tho' it did prevail for 1400 years.

2d Def. p. 364. A mighty boast indeed! How many errors are of an older date? Do the *Scriptures* say one word of it? No, except it be to contradict it, by giving different attributes and properties to Father and Son; they tell us the Son is the *image* of the Father's *substance*, as is the true rendering of the word, *Heb. i. 3.* See *Dr. W.'s Serm. p. 154.* Surely if it were the *same one substance*, it was flat and low to say the

Euseb.

cont. Mar-

cel. p. 25.

image of his substance; the thing and the image thereof are never one and the same; it is only *like* the same, and may be one *specifically*. Indeed it is hard to know in what sense the Doctor takes the *consubstantiality* by his words, *2d Def. p. 176.* telling us, *the Son is not only consubstantial, but one substance with the Father, as from him and inseparably*

inseparably contain'd in him, that is the same one single substance, and therefore, as I think, not the image of him.

S E C T. IV.

*Of the Son's inferiority to the Father
in answer to Dr. Waterland.*

WAVING the points of vain philosophy, viz. *consubstantiality, coeternity, and necessary existence*, which are matters of mere philosophy, where men easily run into dark mazes and labyrinths, and having no sufficient guide chuse to distract themselves with the opinions of antient (not the primo-primitive) Christian Fathers, who are so very confused, so inconsistent, so disagreeing, not to say often so rash and so weak, that usually men come off from the search with the utmost uncertainty in matters of nice and deep speculation. I say waving these,

I shall consider what is more to our purpose, and more obvious to our apprehension, viz. the *superiority* of God the *Father* and *inferiority* of Jesus Christ *his Son*, in opposition to what is alledged by Dr. *Waterland*. * This is of much greater importance in the *Trinitarian* controversy, and more decisive than all his articles about *divine substance*, and *persons*, and *eternal generation*, and *necessary existence*, or even the title and character of *God*, as what will best discover the proper sense of that title.

The Doctor owns directly, that the *Son* is of *inferior original* *, but denies inferiority of dignity and authority, or that the Father is ruler over his Son, or the Son *naturally* subject to the dominion of the Father, owning no inferiority

G g 4

but

* Def. p. 386.

but of *order* or office, and that too but *economical* or by consent, which might have been otherwise in the Nature of the thing, if they had so agreed †; sensible that if real inferiority be granted, his other arguments must all fail. Let us therefore see how this matter stands in the holy Gospel and primitive Fathers, and what his objections are against it and his evasions.

I. In the Gospel history our Lord appears with most evident marks of subjection and inferiority to his God and Father, but this will be placed to his human nature, after he took flesh, in his state of humiliation, and yet his own mouth has told us, that it was so before he took flesh *John 6. 38. For I came down from heaven, says he, not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me*, words of equal subjection with those in *Luke 22. 42. Nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done*, or *John 12. 27. Father save me from this hour, but for this cause came I unto this hour*.

In vain is it to say, as Mr. Boyse does, that it means *not to do my own will only, but also my Father's*, for at this rate our Lord might have inverted the words, and as truly have said, that *he came not to do his Father's will* (i. e. not only his) *but his own*; and so might the words of his agony be interpreted, *Not thy will, O Father, be done, but mine*, i. e. mine also. No, it is extremely disingenuous, and without ordinary modesty, to hope to impose such harsh things on any men of understanding, who plainly see in such words submissive obedience to the will of a *superior*, and not a bare complaisant compliance with that of an equal. All this was when he came down at first, and so before he became man; nay at the first creation he *obeyed and ministered* to the Father,

† 2 Def. p. 177. Farther Vindic. p. 50.

Father, say the Antients, *i. e.* before man's fall or need of a mediator.

Again, when he was returning to heaven, into his glory which he expected, then he said *My Father is greater than I*, which is the same as to say *I am not so great as he*. Too weak is the vulgar evasion, that this is not spoken of his divine nature, which would make our Lord's argument of no strength; the learned therefore are forced to allow it of the divine nature with the antient *Albanasians*, and that because of his inferior original. As from the Father he derives his being, so the Father is greater, that is, says Dr. W. is *prior* in order but not in authority or power, but Christ owns a *majority*, not only a *priority* of order, which among absolute equals is but ceremony and courtesy, and therefore to call it a greatness of *priority*, and then to turn that priority into nothing but *order*, *i. e.* first in conception, without *any greatness* in it, is treachery and deceit*. As to the voluntary oeconomy I shall consider that presently.

Again, after Christ's exaltation it is still the same, *God is the head of Christ*, as Christ is the head of every man. 1. Cor. 11. 3. Christ is set over all by the Father, and is to surrender all to him 1 Cor. 15. 27. When the *Father* is said to be above all *Ephes.* 4. 6. no exception of the *Son* is at any time put in, but here, when the *Son* is said to have all things put under him, the *Father* is carefully excepted, a limitation, which the *Father's* supremacy admits not of.

II. As to the primitive Fathers sense in this point, the Doctor grants what is notorious to all readers, that they perpetually own the Son or Word to have *ministred* to (or subserved) the Father in the making the world, and to be

G g 4

his

* Sermon p. 49. Farth. Vind. p. 50.

his angel or messenger ; in short, that the Father commanded, and the Son obeyed *, so *Irenæus*, *Clemens*, *Origen*†: The controversy then will issue in this, whether *the being under the command of another be not inferiority*. Is not this the plain notion of it? It is not only the freely performing an act of subjection, like Christ's washing the disciples feet ||, but being under just command, bid and bound to do it. Would *Peter* have commanded Christ to wash his feet, or could he forbid it? No, but here it is so. It avails nothing what those Fathers thought of Christ's substance or necessary existence, since they held *this inferiority*; if *consistently*, then they judged he might be *one in substance* and yet *inferior*, as one man may be a subject of another, who is his ruler, altho' of no better substance; which shews their sense of the matter was not to prove equality of authority from equality of nature; if *not consistently*, then are they of no regard here, but hold it they did, if words can express it, *viz.* that *the Son was under the command of the Father*, a superior person to him, tho' of the same nature, and tho' with the Father he had a joint dominion over all others.

The Doctor thinks to evade this by saying, that it all relates to his having *an inferior office* by his own free consent according to the voluntary *æconomy* among the three divine persons **. But will the Doctor say, that almighty God is under the *command* and disposal of another, be he of what nature and substance he will? If we separate the *dominion* from the *nature*, our concern lies chiefly with God *relatively*, as our ruler, more than with his abstracted *substance* or necessary existence, we are guided by his law and

* Serm. p. 73. 76. 2d Def. p. 107. 108. † Defen. p. 188. || 2d Def. p. 19. ** 2d Defen. p. 20. 416.

and *moral* perfections, more than by notions of his philosophical *natural* substance. Yet I may tell him from *Tertullian*, that his pretended voluntary œconomy, unscriptural as it is, (for the Scriptures never say, that the Father sought or asked the consent of the Son or Spirit to send them) seems to me so far from being the *ground* of the Father's dominion over the Son, that it appears to me to be the *consequence* and result of that dominion as prior, it being the Father's œconomy and order of them to this or that ministry, as he pleased: thus *Tertullian** says, in this œconomy *Pater voluit*, &c. the Father willed the Son to be on earth and himself in Heaven &c. and so *Justin Martyr* †, this the Doctor allows ||. Not a word of the consent or will of *all three*, but of the *Father* only, whereas the condescending party's will seems most needful in the case, if they had not been subject to the Father. Their consent with obedience shews not, that God's right of commanding was only from an agreement as among equals, for he covenants with good men, and they consent, but yet were bound to it beforehand.

When the Doctor is told how the Fathers say *The Son was begotten according to the will of the Father*, he replies, this notes only his *consent* and liking, but not that it was in him precarious or arbitrary will; so then I may have the same leave to say, if the Son or Spirit agree to the same œconomy or disposition, yet their liking proves not that they were at liberty to do otherwise; yet it is not said that their agreement was required in the matter. No, the disposition of the monarchy was into as many names, *quot Deus voluit*, nay *Tertullian* intimates, that when the œconomy shall cease, and the monarchy shall be restored to the Father according to 1 Cor. 15. 24—28.

then

* Cont. Prax. c. 23. † Dial p. 370. || 2d Def. p. 285, 286.

then shall the Son be subjected to the Father, and that by this means the divine monarchy was preserved, which the Father might administer by his Son, or by whom else he pleased; so that this oeconomy demonstrates plainly the *Father's* antecedent superiority to the *Son* and *Spirit*, and that it arises not from an agreement *merely oeconomic*, as the Doctor would have it; but may for all this be a *natural* dominion.

The Doctor is then very injurious to this *pre-eminent superiority* of the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, whom he denies to be his *inferior* but from his own condescension, and so it is only at the Son's pleasure: The Doctor who is so often disturbed at the suspicion of the Son's being thought a *precarious* being, begotten at the will of the Father, has yet no fear in him of making the almighty supreme Father but a *precarious Lord*, and of *precarious authority* over the Son*. Where is his proof, that ever the Son's previous agreement was supposed to give leave to the Father to rule? Nor do I conceive such consent gives any authority, but when it really divests the party resigning of his own power, as is the case, when one man becomes the subject of another, else it is absurd to say *he* is under authority, *who* remains as powerful to command the other, as that other him; such an one may persuade to act in concert, but surely would not pretend to *command* him, who is his equal in power and right. The Doctor must suppose the Son of a nature, from which supreme authority (negative at least, so as to be under none) is unalienable, that he can't separate supremacy from his being, else if he had really given up his equality to the Father, then he would become so much less than he in *dominion*; and then why not by *nature*, if it may be *voluntarily*

* Farth. Vind. p. 90.

fairly so; but if not, then this pretended economy does not answer: for sure if the Father commanded his Word, as is fully granted on all hands, then had he just authority so to do; and if it was by just authority, then was it requisite he should be obeyed, and the Son could have no right to refuse subjection, which if an equal he might: Note this was before man was created, when no office of mediator was wanted; and yet this subjection hinders not the Son from being still *Lord of the universe*, and having one *common dominion with the Father*, tho it be in subordination under him.

After all, the Doctor seems not to have right notions of this dominion of the Father, and inferiority of the Son; for suppose *the Son is naturally a subject of the Father, and the Father his sovereign Lord*; then, says he, *he has an absolute right over him to call him to account, to reward him if he does well, to punish him if he does amiss: this all men understand*, says he, *by supreme dominion, to compel, constrain, punish and to bridle at pleasure* †. Any one may easily see what an invidious representation this is of the case; that the Father *commands, disposes, and rewards* the Son, is indeed part of dominion, which 'tis plain the Father has exercised; but as to *compelling, constraining, punishing, and bridling* him, reverence for his beloved Son, in whom he is always well pleased, should teach us to forbear such language; he is one with him in intire harmony and conformity of will, does always what pleases him; so none of these things need to be mentioned: As St. Paul says, *the law is not made for the righteous, but for the lawless*, so I say, *compelling, constraining, &c.* has nothing to do in the dominion over a perfectly obedient Son, that never offends. I would ask the Doctor, if he thinks this fit to be

† 2d Def. p. 18.

476 *Observations on Dr. Waterland.*

be said even of the man Christ Jesus, (after his notion) who certainly is the subject and creature of the Father. Will he chuse to say any thing of power to *constrain, punish, and bridle him?* which he irreverently supposes to be the meaning of his opponent, saying, *Is this your meaning?* It is not supposed by the Doctor's adversaries, that our Lord is in that low subjection, that men or angels are, but in the subjection of a Son.

Heb. 3. 4. *Moses was faithful as a servant, but Christ as a*
 5. *Son over God's house.* Moses talked face to face,
 Deut. 39. but this Son of his bosom had much greater inti-
 10. macy and favour, nay, *to which of the angels said*

Heb. 1. 5. *he at any time, Thou art my Son?* He is dignified as a Son greatly regarded by the Father, whom he serves; the state of a son is quite different from that of a servant, tho' yet under the Father too. Indeed our Lord, tho' a Son, is of the governing part over all, excepting him who set him over all with all power in heaven and earth; it is but *one authority* in God and in his vicegerent, altho' not in both alike absolutely, eminently, independently, and in equal degree.

We need not trouble our selves here about the *One substance or nature*, for a subject may be of the same (or perhaps better) substance in kind with his prince, and yet be really under his dominion; it is not the *substance* which we pay subjection to, but the *authority* and power is all in the case. Since therefore it is allow'd there may be a voluntary commanding superiority in the Father, this shews that the substance or nature of the Son, whatever it be, is capable of subjection, and acting a ministerial part, so that it is not *essential* to his nature to have the same authority with the Father, while yet it appears very just to suppose the Father to have a *natural* superiority over him.

MEMOIRS

OF THE

LIFE and SENTIMENTS

Of the Reverend

Dr. Samuel Clarke.

1731.

MEMOIRS

OF THE

LIFE AND SENTIMENTS

OF THE REVEND

Dr. Samuel Clarke.



Memoirs of the Life and Sentiments of the Reverend Dr.
SAMUEL CLARKE.

I Had no acquaintance with Dr. *Clarke* in the former part of his life, but on reading his sermons at Mr. *Boyle's* lecture, when first published, I remarked and extracted some things out of them, which I apprehended could not come from a man of deep thought and judgment in consistency with the common notions of a Trinity of co-equal divine persons; and tho I then knew nothing of him but from his writings, yet I suspected he could not be a right *Athanasian*; particularly from his VIIth proposition of the being of God, viz. "*That it follows from his necessary existence, that God must of necessity be BUT ONE;*" "*and that it were an express contradiction to suppose two different natures should be necessarily existent, since it will be no contradiction to suppose one of them might exist alone, and the other not to exist, and consequently not to be necessarily existent.*" I concluded, that the same reasons lay against two different necessarily existent persons, and that one infinite almighty all-sufficient divine person may as easily be supposed to exist alone without another, as one divine being, and so that one alone be all that is necessarily existent by the same strict method of reasoning.

And

And indeed I imagine some strength in this reasoning, because such, as stand up for three necessarily existent co-equal divine persons with Dr. *Waterland* and others, seem so well aware of this consequence, that they are for quitting this great principle of natural religion concerning the *Unity of God*; denying it to be any *certain* principle of *natural* religion at all, that there is *BUT ONE GOD* or *BUT ONE NECESSARILY EXISTENT BEING*, referring to the *Scripture alone* to decide this point, and to instruct us what number there may be of almighty Gods, whether but *one* or *many*, and here it is they learn to say *There is but one God*. Thus the author of the *Remarks on Dr. Clarke's exposition of the church catechism*, p. 65. allows it but *probable*, not *certain*, by the light of nature; and Mr. *Brown*, the defender of Dr. *Waterland*, makes the challenge with great courage, *Demonstrate then*, says he, *that there can be but one all-perfect being* *; so that if by *natural* light the *Unity of God* be demonstrable (which Dr. *Clarke* undertook to show, and without which the heathens are not inexcusable in their polytheism) it will be difficult for these gentlemen to make out their *three necessarily existent persons* consistent with that principle, which therefore they seem not very fond of seeing proved by the light of nature.

Some time after his *Scripture-doctrine of the Trinity* had been published, I became *personally* acquainted with him, tho at first he was upon the reserve, as he afterwards acknowledged to me. The first time that we had any free discourse, as I remember, was at the house of Dr. *Cannon*, (afterwards Dean of *Lincoln*) the said Doctor inviting me thither with a desire, that I should speak to Dr. *Clarke* my sentiments of his said book,

* *Brown's Animadversions on two pieces*, p. 16, 17.

book, and talk with him about it. Accordingly we entred into some discourse, and I mentioned something, which I excepted against in his 27th proposition, where he asserted, "that in Scripture the *bighest* titles are ascribed to the Son, "even such as include *all* divine powers, except absolute supremacy and independency;" because to suppose these communicable is, he says, an expreis contradiction, and particularly he extends this to all divine *knowledge*, as appears by the texts set down in proof of his proposition, so that I thought he plainly intimated, that the *Son* had all possible perfections, that God the *Father* could communicate, to the utmost.

Upon this I said to him, that as my great concern, in what I had done in this controversy, was chiefly to preserve sacred the everlasting *distinction*, which must be between the *unoriginate absolute first cause* of all, and all *derived* beings produced by his good pleasure; so I doubted, that he had not sufficiently secured *this*, because he seem'd to assert the *same* divine power, knowledge, and every other infinite perfection to be in the *Son*, only that these perfections had been communicated to him from the *Father*, but were in other respects as great and extensive as the *Father's*, tho' derived from him. I further said, that since he held the *Son's being* to be the *voluntary* production of the *Father*, it followed, that he could have no more than what the *Father pleased* to communicate to him, that therefore it could not be certainly known, that he had *all* which could *possibly* be communicated, unless it appear'd that this was the *will* of the *Father*, which is by no means clear; nay on the contrary we find rather, that *all possible* communicable perfections were *not* communicated to him, since he had not the knowledge of the time of

that great future event, or of that great day, *Mat. 24. 36. Mark 13. 32.* I don't remember that he gainsaid this, but whether upon considering the matter he might think that proposition did not imply so much, as I apprehended in it or not, I cannot say, but I did not find in his second edition, that he had alter'd it. At this time he told me he had read my tract, *viz. A Vindication of the worship of our Lord Jesus Christ on Unitarian principles*, and that I had answered Mr. Boyse to a demonstration.

Some time after I observed to him, that on his 54th proposition [*viz. there is no clear precept nor example in Scripture for putting up prayer directly to the person of the Holy Spirit*] he had this note; "As there are in Scripture clear examples of offering up prayers to *the Son* for such blessings, as it is the proper office of the Son to bestow, so by analogy the *Holy Spirit* may be desired to convey such gifts, as it is his peculiar office to distribute." I excepted against this as a very uncertain inference, *both because the worship of the Son by prayer is not grounded merely upon his ability to give, but on his dominion over us, which intitles him to that homage, and therefore we pray not to angels, tho they have ability to do much for us, but no dominion that we know of, to act for us at their own disposal, nor do we find any such dominion ascribed to the Holy Spirit, nor ever read in Scripture of his throne, his glory, or majesty, of his servants, his church, or kingdom; and also because the Apostles were as much concerned, as any, to regard this inference or analogy in their own practice, which we don't find they ever did; only they prayed and wish'd for the Holy Spirit's communications, and also for the grace and favour of the seven Spirits of God and of the Lamb*

Lamb sent forth into all the earth, *Rev.* 1. 4. and 5. 6. Thus it was, or to this effect, that I made the objection; what force he might see in this I am not certain, but as I remember not that he opposed it, so I found that in his next edition he left out that note on this proposition, so that I judge he was at least not clear in that point, as he had formerly delivered it. See *Modest Plea*, p. 115.

But I never found that he doubted of the worship of *the Son* by invocation, or that he changed his mind in that *article of worship*, as the author of the *Remarks on Dr. Clarke's exposition of the catechism* would infer, p. 9. from a passage being dropt in the second edition of the *Scripture doctrine*, towards the end of the notes on the 44th proposition, but I think the inference very unjust, for the note omitted was only his own candid interpretation of Archbishop *Wake's* words, *viz.* *That we should pray to God only, and to him as our Father through Jesus Christ our Lord*, by adding as a salvo, "the meaning is "not that prayers may not *at all* be offered to "the Son, but that they must always *ultimately* "be directed to God only, as our Father, through "Christ." This he supposed might be implied, tho' not express; it was not any proposition of his own that he dropt; perhaps he might not think it proper, on some account or other, for him to say what might be that learned Archbishop's meaning, or he might think it needless, and so pass'd it by. But his own proposition 50, which was express upon this article of the *worship of the Son*, stands just as it did before, he alledges the same Scripture examples of the invocation of the Son, and refers to the same texts for it, and particularly to St. Stephen's prayer. See second edition, p. 122. 123. 338.

With what ingenuity or justice then could this author of *the Remarks*, &c. insinuate, that Dr. Clarke at the time of his second edition had alter'd his judgment in this article, when he saw, that in the most proper place he had in express words declared the very same sentiments, and as fully as he had before? yet so vehement is he in urging this accusation, that he labours to strengthen it from the *Modest plea*, which, says he, being publish'd the same year with the second edition of *the Scripture-doctrine*, and by the same author, may be presumed to be written with the same views as the *Exposition*; and yet out of this he makes just nothing at all, arguing from bare omissions only; like the omission in relation to Archbishop Wake's words abovemention'd; for in the *Modest Plea* itself (here brought to prove Dr. Clarke's opposing the direct worship of any person beside the Father only) it is expressly declared, that when he says all worship is to be directed to the Father through Christ, (the very thing which the Remarker spends his censure on) he excepts such worship, as may be paid to Christ as mediator, for which, says he, we have express warrant from examples in Scripture, and the Revelation of St. John affords several instances of this worship paid to Christ, &c. See *Modest plea* p. 115. So that the Remarker was either very rash in censuring a book he had never read over; or very partial and unjust in forming a judgment of Dr. Clarke's opinions merely from his silence in one part, against his direct positive profession to the contrary in other parts of the same book.

The whole truth of the matter, as far as I can judge, is this: Dr. Clarke insisted but sparingly on the absolute and direct worship of the Son by prayer in comparison of the Father, as judging this last to be the chief and most important article in

in the Christian religion, viz. to offer our prayers to God the Father through Jesus Christ, which our Lord has laid down as the rule of our practice, *John* 16. 26. *At that day ye shall ask the Father in my name*, without mention of prayer to himself; tho on some particular rare occasions we may find examples of prayer to him. The Remarker himself says, p. 13. *No one denies, that the primitive Christians generally offered up prayers to the Father through Christ.* And again, p. 15. *Very right, this is the ordinary rule and method of praying.* And Dr. Waterland in his own person and name says, *All worship is primarily and eminently the Father's*, and † *that our prayers are generally to be offer'd RATHER THRO' the Son THAN TO him*; and again ‖, to the Father *DIRECTLY*, to the Son *OBLIQUELY* or interpretatively. Is it any wonder then, that Dr. Clarke should not so much inculcate the *direct* (as the oblique) worship of Christ by prayer, which yet he grants might on some special occasion be used, when it is yielded by the Remarker himself, that it is not generally to be used, nor was so among the primitive Christians, but the other method is rather to be practised? and surely *that*, which is rather to be used, is best for Christians, and was fittest to be urged *most* by Dr. Clarke, tho he did not set aside the *other* as unlawful, when he omitted to press the *general* use of it.

Indeed there is no example in the Scriptures of any solemn stated general prayers to Jesus Christ in the ordinary offices of devotion; the prayer of Stephen, *Acts* 7. was a single petition on that extraordinary special occasion of his visible appearance or representation before his eyes: The other

H h 3

instances

* Def. p. 260.

† Ibid. p. 262. and 2d Def. p. 392.

‖ See 2d Def. p. 401.

instances alledg'd, such as *God and our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way to you, — and comfort you*; and those salutations, *Grace and peace to you from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ*, are rather pious wishes of good from than prayers to him, and are directed and spoken not to Christ, but to Christians, to you and you; whereas prayer speaks to the object of it, to God or Christ himself, and not to the persons prayed for.

And perhaps this may be some part of that difference, which Origen puts between solemn proper prayer, which he appropriates to God the Father, and prayer in a catechrestical or less proper sense, which he allows to Christ. *Contra Cels.* p. 233. which exactly agrees with his book, *Περὶ ἑξῆς*, (which Dr. Waterland would have not to be genuine, or at least to be contradicted by his later writing against Celsus, whereas in truth it strongly confirms it) where he asserts, that some prayer, *προσευχὴ*, may not be address'd to Christ himself: According to him, the most solemn prayer is for God only, and yet some allow'd to our great High-priest obliquely as mediator; so that Dr. Clarke may well be supposed to speak of the most solemn stated ordinary prayer (according to the ordinary rule prescribed by Christ himself, *John* 16. 23, 26.) and yet not be against either oblique interpretative prayer, or some direct prayer to Jesus Christ.

As to the passages in the Clementine Constitution Liturgy, which are cited on this head, they correspond to what I have here said: *The one*, Book 7. chap. 43. has not one word of any prayer to Christ in it, it only says, the person to be baptized should adore Christ, and give him thanks after the Father: *The other*, which the Remarker calls a solemn pompous prayer, intirely directed to God

God the Son, Book 8. chap. 7. after an honourable mention of Christ's triumph over the devil, has no more than this single petition to the Son, *Rebuke these wicked spirits, and deliver the work of thy hands from their power*; and this only on occasion of the *Energumeni*, or the possessed with the devil, whom it had been our Lord's great concern to heal, when on earth; but surely this lone short transient request is not the making Christ the object of stated general common prayer in a long series of petitions *equally with the Father*.

I never at any time perceiv'd in him the least doubt of the truth of real genuine Christianity, whatever corruptions have since been introduced into the profession of it; and particularly he has sometimes expressed himself very much affected with the wonderful evidence of a divine inspiration in the prophecies of *St. John's* revelation, which relate to the *Great Whore*; he thought it otherwise unconceivable how *St. John* should be able at that time to foretel, that *Rome*, the city of seven hills and which then reigned over so many nations and over the kings of the earth, should become such a mother of spiritual harlots by gross idolatries, with whom so many kings and nations should commit fornication, and be deceiv'd to agree to give their kingdom to the beast, and should also become such a bloody persecutor of the saints, &c. and this in such lively colours as he describes it in: This or something to this effect was what he thought very convincing, and intimated that *Sir Isaac Newton* had the same sentiments.

We once fell into discourse about the superstitious and dangerous mistaken notions in many poor ignorant persons of the *Lord's-supper*, who

are ready to think, that the bare receiving the sacrament with some external decency in a sober mood gives them a present title to heaven, just as common titles pass among men by formal conveyances in law; I then mentioning what strange purposes superstition could make this sacrament serve to, when even in St. *Austin's* time we find a Christian woman applying it to cure the blind eyes of her son, he said, it was so still with some among us, and that himself once had great contention with one, who pressed to have of the remains of the sacramental wine to keep for some medicinal use, as she had formerly had, (as if the *Eucharist* were appointed to work bodily cures in a natural way like physic,) but he refused to give it, alledging the authority of the rubric, which orders, that the consecrated remains be not carried out of the church; and yet he did not herein *slight* this positive institution*, which he esteem'd an excellent means to a nobler end than *bodily* cures, viz. the increase of true piety and virtue.

The Remarker, p. 94 †, seems to me very rash and inconsiderate in charging the *Deism* and *Atbeism* of these days as owing to the natural consequences of *Arianism*, i. e. as he means, of such writings on the Trinity, as Dr. *Clarke's* and others of that kind, when it will so obviously recoil with more terrible force on himself, if he, by doing so much (in opposition to Dr. *Clarke*) to subvert the *Unity* of God, and to introduce *Polytheism*, (tho he might not think or design it) has been all along opening a most plain way to *Atbeism*; for it has been long a current maxim, *Deus aut unus aut nullus*; so that he, who imposes on men the

* As the Remarker insinuates, p. 85. † And Import. p. 295.

the notion of three co-equal Gods, (in reality so, tho under other names) as an article of revealed religion, leaves them no way to shun *Atheism*, but by a retreat to *Deism*, as the only medium between *Atheism*, and such *Polytheism*, as they are made to believe is a fundamental article of the *Christian*, but are convinced is opposite to *natural* religion.

I am satisfied, tho the best things may be abused, that it was to prevent the occasion and the growth of infidelity, that Dr. Clarke and others have endeavour'd to clear the gospel of Christ from some *absurd* notions *falsely* father'd upon it, and which have been maintain'd with the great hazard of and indifferency about the *divine Unity*: But it will be a sufficient rebuke to this author, to put any understanding impartial man upon reading and comparing his and Dr. Clarke's writings in behalf of *reveal'd* religion, from whence he may see who it is has been the *ablest* and most *successful* defender of that and of *natural* religion; and yet both of them may have had an earnest zeal for truth, and a sacred regard for the Scriptures, which may have been perverted or mistaken by one, but are still solemnly appealed to by both.

When on the prospect of the renowned Sir Isaac Newton's death, and thereby an approaching vacancy of the office of *Master of the Mint*, that post had been determined for Dr. Clarke, he once came to talk with me about it to know what I thought of his acceptance of it. He said he had not sought for it, and some were uneasy at it, pressing him to renounce it beforehand, which he was not for doing, nor did it seem requisite, since as it was a designed respect and favour to him,

Supposed to be Dr. Waterland.

him, so it was a distant uncertain thing, which he might never have occasion to determine upon, or if he should, it would then be a most proper time to do it.

As to my own thoughts of the matter I freely told him in these or very near these words, "That it was an office which no man of his order had ever taken, as I supposed, that it would be an avocation from the studies and business of his calling and charge, that it would abate of the reverence and respect paid to him as a Minister, and he would be look'd on as a German bishop, half lay-man and half priest, and be less useful in his function than otherwise he might be: Also that being plentifully provided for already, it would be asked what might induce him to take such an office, and that it would be imputed to the love of money; But (said I in the Apostle's words) *thou, O man of God, flee these things.*" Whereupon he presently replied, *Whenever I think of it, I am against it nine times in ten.* So that tho he was not absolutely determin'd, yet this shew'd he was not fond of the post. I asked what Sir Isaac said of it, to which he answer'd, It was much the same as I did.

However, upon Sir Isaac Newton's death, when it came to the trial, I soon found that he relinquish'd his claim, which I thought was greatly to his honour; and tho some would not allow it to be so, yet I am sure he thereby avoided a great deal of reproach, which would have been cast upon him, and that probably from some, who in the like circumstances would gladly have accepted the same offer themselves.

But as ecclesiastical dignity was more agreeable to his character, and as he was well known to be in favour at court, where his eminent worth, his great

great fame, his singular abilities and learning, as well as his firm fidelity and affection to their Majesties, had recommended him to their esteem, so it was natural to suppose he might easily obtain such preferment; and tho' he often professed he did not solicit for it, being very well and easy as he was, and not at all prompted by Mrs. Clarke to do otherwise than just what he judged most fit; yet possibly he might have some offers made him. He mention'd several good preferments, which he apprehended might have been obtain'd, but said, He would take *nothing*, which required his *subscription* to the 39 articles, and that he had express'd so much to his superiors.

Once he asked me, what people thought of his not having any preferment, when some others of his friends were advanced? And as I could think of no other, I readily told him, it was thought to be for this reason, *viz. because he was not satisfied with the terms of subscribing, &c.* To which I remember he replied, *This will not hurt my character*; meaning, no doubt, that men would see herein, he had regard to *conscience* above *worldly advantage*. But as no such subscription is required of a bishop, there would not be that objection in case such an offer were made him. This therefore he propounded to some of his friends, as I understood, to consider of and to have their thoughts upon it.

Of this affair he spoke to me more than once, but at first only in general; upon which I said to him, that if there were any likelihood of his being back'd with others, who would be concern'd to promote any good designs for some reformation, one would yield to any thing not sinful; but if it were to be consider'd only as a *personal* respect to himself or his family, it would be of little

little concern, and probably he would not be more happy than in his present station.

I found he did not apprehend he could do much good, complaining, as he oft did, of the general *indifferency* about religion, among most of the great, and that to this it was chiefly owing, that matters *perceiv'd to be amiss* were not attempted to be *rectified*. Which sort of *indifferency* I observed to him had been long manifest among us in this nation from one plain instance, *viz.* that whereas the *generality*, if not *universality* of our clergy have given into the *Arminian* scheme of doctrine, and our *articles* do, in some points at least, plainly carry the face of *Calvinism*, and are commonly esteemed to do so, and the clergy are reproached and intangled with it, yet men seem willing rather to have *them* still subscribed, than to seek for any *amendment* or explanation; when yet they can neither be subscribed as *articles of truth*, (which surely was at first intended) by those, who *do not believe them*, nor yet as *articles of peace*, (as some pretend them to be) by those who readily *preach against them*: so afraid are some of appearing to *change*, tho no man can ever grow wiser but he must needs do so.

But to return to Dr. Clarke.

It is certain an *inferior* bishopric would have afforded no advantage on any account, wherein he might easily have been borne down, and would have been under the controul of a spiritual superior; and therefore as he was very well in his then station, and did not solicit for any, so he said he would not think of any, unless it were the highest; and as this opportunity did not offer, so he was sensible, if it did, he should be opposed, whatever might be their Majesties own favour to him, of which he had a very grateful sense, and probably might

might have some expectation from it. It is therefore very natural to suppose, that this might incline him to use the more caution not to make himself incapable of it, and might be some restraint upon him from that openness and unreserved freedom, which others could more easily exercise, who had given up all expectations of that kind; nor indeed had any the same opportunity or invitation thereto.

Some time in *November* 1727, he wrote me in a familiar letter, *that he had a great mind to talk with me*, if I could come any morning but *Saturday*; accordingly within two or three days I went to him, and we talk'd more freely and closely of these matters; we soberly and fairly consider'd what difficulties and just objections might lie in his way on the supposal of his being offer'd such ecclesiastical dignity; for I must say it, that he ever seem'd to me seriously concerned not to violate his conscience for any preferment, nor to run rashly into great snares, nor did I ever know any man more ready to hear, with all the ease and calmness possible, what might be in reason oppos'd. He never intended by any means to be taken off from professing and defending what he believed to be the *great truths* of the gospel, and in particular said, he intended to print a new edition of his *Scripture-doctrine*, &c. with some additions.

The greatest difficulty which occur'd, as I remember, was the business of *ordination* of priests and deacons. Some things in the prescribed form he did not approve and could not use, particularly the hymn, *Come Holy Ghost eternal God*, &c. but there being liberty to use another hymn, this did not press; some other matters I objected to, which did not stick with him:

But